THE Nation

VOLUME 143 NEW YORK • SATURDAY • DECEMBER 26, 1936 NUMBER 26

CONTENTS

THE SHAPE OF THINGS 745

EDITORIALS:

TEMPEST IN WISCONSIN 748

BEHIND THE SCENES IN CHINA 748

THE VAN SWERINGEN EMPIRE 749

1936, FAREWELL by Max Lerner 750

WASHINGTON WEEKLY by Paul W. Ward 751

HARRY BRIDGES COMES EAST by Louis Adamic 753

WHO'S WHO IN CHINA by Maxwell S. Stewart 754

A SOLUTION FOR PALESTINE by Albert Viton 756

A BODY BLOW FOR TAMMANY by William D. Patterson 759

LAND FOR MEXICO'S PEONS by L. O. Prendergast 760

ISSUES AND MEN by Oswald Garrison Villard 762

BROUN'S PAGE 763

BOOKS AND THE ARTS:

DISCIPLINE FOR GERMAN WRITERS by Klaus Mann 764

LUIGI PIRANDELLO by Delfino Cinelli 765

NEW RHETORIC FOR OLD by William Troy 765

PURSE OF EMPIRE by B. E. Bettinger 766

STERILE LOVE by Mark Van Doren 767

TWO THINKERS FOR ONE by Jacques Barzun 767

SHORTER NOTICES 768

DRAMA: PLAYS, PLEASANT AND UNPLEASANT by Joseph Wood Krutch 769

RECORDS by B. H. Haggin 770

Editors

FREDA KIRCHWEY JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

MAX LERNER

Associate Editors

MARGARET MARSHALL MAXWELL S. STEWART

DOROTHY VAN DOREN

Editorial Associates

HEYWOOD BROUN ALVIN JOHNSON

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

Hugo Van Arx, Business Manager. Walter F. Grueninger, Circulation Manager. Muriel C. Gray, Advertising Manager.

Copyright, 1936, by The Nation, Inc.

The Shape of Things

*

IT SOUNDS TOO GOOD TO BE TRUE. MAYBE there *is* a new Supreme Court in the national capital. The latest decision—upholding the constitutionality of the 1934 American arms embargo in the Chaco dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay—is not only a blow at the munitions profiteers and an aid and comfort to existing and future neutrality legislation. It is also a vindication of the traditional view that has obtained both in legislative tradition and constitutional law, of the scope of the Congressional right to delegate its power to the executive. Justice Sutherland, in writing the opinion of the court, has been careful to limit the very reasonable interpretation of delegation of powers to the field of foreign affairs. There, presumably, the President has access to a range of information denied to Congress to a degree that does not obtain in internal policy. There also lack of freedom of action would prove embarrassing to the government. But a similar generous attitude projected into internal affairs may well validate the sort of delegation involved in the Truth in Securities Act. Perhaps we are growing over-optimistic. But it does seem good to have at least the constitutional cloud removed from the grant of discretionary power to the President in neutrality legislation—a grant which we consider superior to the mandatory legislation. And it seems good also to have the court continuing in its new chastened mood. The earlier decisions this term were either based on technical points or limited to state powers. This decision is on a clear issue of constitutionality, and although it does not involve a New Deal case it involves vast economic interests. And it is good to have the decision seven to one. Justice McReynolds's dissent adds just the touch of reality to make us feel that it is not all a wish-fulfilment dream.

*

SPAIN'S "LITTLE WORLD WAR" HAS REACHED a point where it is becoming increasingly difficult to limit operations within its boundaries. The first few thousand German troops—"Aryan Moors" as they are called in Madrid—proved as ineffective as their African predecessors, and more are reported on the way. In addition, several thousand Irish fascists led by General O'Duffy have reached Spanish shores. While the number of Italians has mysteriously diminished in recent weeks, Italian pilots are still to be found in Franco's ranks. But the most serious complication has arisen out of the sinking by a rebel cruiser of a Soviet freighter bound for Belgium with a cargo of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manganese ore. According to international law, a non-belligerent which attacks another vessel on the high seas ranks as a pirate and may be sunk on sight. Yet if the Soviet sought to enforce the law to this extent, Germany might precipitate a war by rushing to the support of the rebels. The only hopeful element in the situation is the fact that England appears to have thrown its influence definitely on the side of the anti-fascist forces. Captain Anthony Eden's warning to Von Ribbentrop against the dispatch of further German troops may be taken as an indication of an important shift in policy. British influence is said to account also for the sudden chilling in Mussolini's enthusiasm for the rebel cause. Since every day that Madrid holds out makes it more difficult for Germany to aid Franco secretly, the next few weeks may provide a test of Germany's willingness to precipitate an open conflict.

*

TO GO HUNGRY IN WAR TIME MAY IMPLY courage and patriotism, even strength. To go hungry in time of peace is merely depressing—a source of irritation and disaffection, a cause of fear. This is the dilemma that Germany's rulers face at this moment: war still in the offing; hunger right now; and only slogans to bridge the gap. ("Cannon before butter" is one of the favorites.) Germany faces a general economic crisis of which the food shortage is merely the most important symptom, and no solution has been produced even by prestidigitator Schacht except that contained in his repeated demand for colonies. But colonies, if they were granted tomorrow, would not feed Germans this winter. So the leaders of the Third Reich have undertaken the unhappy task of issuing food cards, exhorting the people to endure their hardships patiently, offering as substitutes for butter and lard a submarine fleet twice as strong as that of 1914, and even depicting hopefully the "bread lines in America" and the needy in London's East End. Meanwhile Hitler and Göring have warned the industrialists that they must maintain armament production even though the food shortage, with resulting increases in food imports, will decrease the supply of needed raw materials. These are the tactics of desperation. The fallacy of autarchy has caught up with the Third Reich. It is possible that outside financial aid may be offered to postpone collapse or war. But Britain is said to have refused help unless the vast rearmament program is checked, and Germany to have replied that a suspension of the program would bring immediate disaster. So the dilemma remains.

*

BEHIND A VEIL OF LEGISLATIVE REGULARITY so thin that the gleam of bayonets shows through, Colonel Fulgencio Batista, Cuba's military dictator, has moved to force out of office President Miguel Mariano Gomez, who was installed with democratic ceremony last May following the first elections to be held since the fall of Machado in 1933. The issue which brought about the crisis, like the other points on which the President and the Colonel have differed in the past few months, is clearly that of civil versus military rule in the island. The crime of Gomez consists in his having opposed a law inspired by Batista which puts a tax of nine cents a bag on raw sugar for the purpose of establishing 2,300 rural schools staffed by the army. Seven hundred such schools have already been put in operation. Gomez calls it fascism; Batista calls it a measure to benefit "the poorest classes in the island." At the same time Batista has won the support of the mill-owners in the usual fascist way. "The National Sugar Mill Owners," reads a laconic dispatch, "which first opposed the sugar-tax bill, reversed its stand because army leaders told them plainly that troops protecting their mill property from strike damages would be withdrawn forthwith. They came to the conclusion that nine cents a bag was cheap insurance." Batista has learned well the language as well as the methods of the modern demagogue. "The armed forces," he declaims, "created by a revolution of the people are always behind the legislative power. . . ." They are so close behind the legislative power, in fact, that a majority of legislators have voted the impeachment of President Gomez for exercising his right to veto what he considers a vicious law.

*

THAT THE NEW HOLY WAR OF THE CATHOLIC church upon communism is no mere caprice on the part of *Nation* editors—as several of our correspondents have implied—is indicated by an Associated Press dispatch from Vatican City. "Thousands of speeches, lectures, and debates are given daily in all parts of the world," so the dispatch runs, "by Catholic priests and laymen . . . illustrating the dangers and ambushes of the Communist program and propaganda." Moreover, the Holy Father himself is described as the director of the worldwide fight against communism. Plans for a "special universal organization" composed of Catholics and Protestants to fight the Communist "menace" are under way. Liberals all over the world must recognize this fight for what it is—a campaign against democracy. For in the present world the anti-Communist fight is a pro-fascist one.

*

"A GENERAL WAVE OF SYMPATHY IS PASSING from one plant to another when labor trouble develops." Thus *Ward's Reports,* a coldly statistical news service of the automotive industry, takes account of the C. I. O.'s industrial-union drive, which since the election has been speeded up in every field. The Steel Workers' Organizing Committee has just celebrated its conquest of the company union at a meeting in Pittsburgh where "employee representatives" of forty-two plants strung from Cleveland to the Atlantic Coast bit the hand of the steel companies that have been feeding them. They formed the "C. I. O. Representatives' Council," proposed a national convention of all steel workers, and demanded $5 minimum pay for labor. The automobile industry faces serious stoppages as a result of strikes in various auxiliary plants, and John L. Lewis has announced a forthcoming test of union strength against General Motors. He charged the corporation with discrimination against union men, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the La Follette committee has received similar charges which it plans to investigate. One of the tightest tie-ups in honor of recovery and the C. I. O. now obtains in the glass industry, thanks to the Flat Glass Workers, affiliated with the C. I. O. and one of the most interesting labor groups in the country. Its president, Glen McCabe, was formerly an official of a glass workers' union whose members were so skilled and so few that it approximated a guild. Now Mr. McCabe, in spite of his long craft-union past, has become the militant leader of an industrial union whose strike has closed down 90 per cent of the country's production of flat and safety glass. Meanwhile John L. Lewis faces a possible strike in his own industry. The owners are proposing to increase hours, and we may be sure that one of their objectives is to administer a defeat to the man who is directing the present union offensive.

*

GOVERNOR EARLE OF PENNSYLVANIA HAS embarked on a tour of the bootleg coal areas of his state. Five years ago the coal companies, seeing their market halved by the depression and the use of other fuels, and unable to produce coal at a profit for the prices they could get, started closing many of their collieries. Thousands of workers were thus thrown on their own—non-existent—resources. Widespread bootleg mining was the result. Firmly organized into a sort of union called the Independent Anthracite Miners' Association, the bootleggers have become a power in their communities. Local politicians compete for their support, business is grateful to them, the local press upholds them, and when the coal owners try to have them arrested, local juries refuse to indict or convict them. Time and again Governor Earle has refused the demand of the companies that he call out the state militia to clear the bootleggers off their property. But seeing the 1940 Presidential nomination out of the corner of one eye, he cannot continue to wink with the other at an admittedly illegal situation, no matter how justified. The bootlegging is clearly the result of price chaos in an industry that cries aloud for regulation. Though the Guffey Coal Act is still fresh in its grave, Earle has said that nationalization, which he defines as "federal regulation and control," may be the only solution. We agree on the ultimate need for nationalization, but—unlike Governor Earle—we should prefer to call a spade a spade.

*

"HERE, WHY DON'T YOU SIT DOWN AND read the pictures," says the manager of the dumb wrestler in "Swing Your Lady" as he thrusts a tabloid into the illiterate's hand. That pretty well sums up what has long been the general opinion concerning the function of photographic journalism. But the recent appearance of such periodicals as the new *Mid-Week Pictorial* and *Life*, as well as the popularity of the various photographic annuals that have been offered for the Christmas season, shows that the pictorial technique is no longer limited to the tabloid audience but is reaching the sophisticated as well. It makes us wonder if the phenomenon may not have consequences more important than has been imagined. There has, for example, just reached our desk a copy of the "Leica Annual" which contains, among other things, a now famous picture of Herbert Hoover sunk in an ignoble doze during an academic ceremony at the University of California. It reminds us of another we have seen of F. D. R. eating a hot dog, and it suggests the firm conviction that a past documented in this fashion can never become heroic in the sense that the past now is. Willy-nilly we see Washington crossing the Delaware in terms of the famous Lutz canvas. Had a candid camera been on the spot we should think very differently of the event. And today a candid camera always is on the spot. In a sense the limits of the "romantic past" have been fixed by the popularization of photography. Nothing which happened after the year 1925 can ever be truly "glamorous."

*

THE *BLACK CORPS*, EDITORIAL ORGAN OF THE Hitler Special Guard, has come out for nudism so long as it is Nordic, Nazi, and national, as opposed to the international, Social Democratic, and Communistic brands which formerly prevailed. This left nudism, which is denounced by the *Black Corps* because it functioned through "secret leagues," was wiped out in 1933 as a cultural aberration and a threat to public order. The new nudism will not be an underground movement; and the article in the *Black Corps* indicates that its main purpose is to make possible "a racial choice in the interests of races in the future." Moreover, it is not to be confined to city slickers as in former days but is to be recommended to the peasantry, "to prevent their suffering from a wholly one-sided physical development." The advantages of a nation-wide nudist movement for the Third Reich are obvious. It would save work for the Gestapo, since it would cut down the search in search and seizure; it would mean a saving in the material used for clothes; and it would prepare the people for the glorious day when their diet will consist of one look at a new submarine and a crust of ersatz. Psychologically, however, it might have disastrous effects. What will happen when the average German, come to the public square to make his "racial choice" from among the candidates assembled there in Nordic nakedness, notices the unhappy effects of a lack of butter in the national diet?

*

DOROTHY VAN DOREN'S RESIGNATION LEAVES *The Nation* poorer in many ways. Her long association with the journal, continuing with brief intermissions from the first year after Mr. Villard sold the *Evening Post* and established *The Nation* as an independent weekly, gave her work a degree of perspective and sophistication that only long experience can supply. In addition she was versatile, with the trained journalist's capacity to accomplish smoothly and expeditiously the whole range of editorial tasks. Her abilities will be missed. Happily, in the intervals of her independent work, she will continue to contribute to *The Nation*—chiefly to the book pages.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tempest in Wisconsin

WE PRINT elsewhere in the issue a report by Paul W. Ward and an article by Oswald Garrison Villard on the tempest which the Glenn Frank case has raised in Wisconsin. American university life may not always contribute much to building a great culture, but it always makes excellent politics. Mr. Ward points out conclusively that no question of academic freedom is involved on either side. But charges of politics fly thick as hailstones. Since President Frank is a Republican and Governor La Follette a Progressive, the issue is seen as reaching beyond the Madison campus or the statehouse. In fact, there is even a suggestion, since the two men concerned have been mentioned for the next national election campaign, that what is happening in Madison may be but a dress rehearsal for a struggle of Titans in 1940. It is this aspect, perhaps, rather than any deep concern for educational policy that has brought the Newspaper Publishers' Association to Mr. Frank's defense.

The broad general question the episode raises, however, is the relation of politics to education. First of all, we must remember that in the nature of the situation there can be no complete divorce between the two. Whether for good or ill, we must accept the fact that state universities have by their very set-up a political responsibility and are likely therefore to have a measure of political responsiveness. We may not like this, and we may, and should, strive to minimize it. But the fact remains. This responsibility should never touch the faculty or the student body; as soon as we begin to coerce them into expounding or holding particular political views, we have taken a step toward a totalitarian society. But just as in an endowed university the *administration* is subject to the control of the trustees, who in the main—let us not forget it—are responsive to the weight of opinion in the financial community, so the *administration* of the state university is subject to the people's representatives in the state government. This means legislature, governor, regents. It would be less than fair to the whole state to take the control of university administration out of the hands of the regents, and since the regents are appointed by the governor, this means that the governor has a definite place in the set-up.

Whether Governor La Follette has abused that place is not entirely clear. If he has he should be criticized severely, but the weight of the evidence does not seem against him. His legitimate function was to appoint the regents. To accuse him of "packing" the board is as idle as to accuse Mr. Roosevelt, in his next appointment to fill a Supreme Court vacancy, of "packing" the court. But, once appointed, state regents, like Supreme Court justices, are best left to their own devices—although neither should be immune from public criticism. The function of the regents is clear enough. They must appoint, reappoint, or fail to reappoint presidents in the light of the best educational standards and their duty to the state and the people.

This brings us squarely up against the principal—in fact, the only real—issue in dispute. How fit is Glenn Frank to continue as president of the university? This, we submit, is a question for the regents to settle. They may settle it well or ill, but the job is theirs. A wrong solution may imply misjudgment, but it involves no martyrdom. We are glad the regents will hold an open hearing, if only because it will cut under the charge that they are embarked on a conspiracy. But essentially this will weaken their position. The very nature of a hearing is such that the more tangible —and therefore the more trivial-sounding—complaints are pushed forward. But the real grounds for firing Glenn Frank can no more be threshed out in open hearing than could the grounds for hiring him—or the grounds for breaking up a marriage. This is a divorce case, and we all know that divorce cases as they are fought out in open court never do justice to the final operative cause: the parties just don't love each other.

That's it. Wisconsin just doesn't love Glenn Frank, and it is even doubtful whether Glenn Frank loves Wisconsin. He has lost the confidence of a majority of the regents. The legislators can't stand him. The younger men on the faculty feel that he gives them no chance for advancement or real effectiveness. The community—and in a Western state the community *is* the college—thinks him uppish. There is a widespread mistrust of his judgment. Add to all that the paradox of a candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination as the university head in the most progressive state in the Union, and you complete a picture of discord. If the regents wish at this date to correct an original error, that is their privilege.

Behind the Scenes in China

IN THE week which has passed since the kidnapping of Chiang Kai-shek it has become evident that Chang Hsueh-liang miscalculated if he thought he would immediately capture the leadership of the national anti-Japanese movement. Only one general, and he a former subordinate of Chang's, has openly rebelled against Nanking. Even those who approved most heartily of the Young Marshal's pronouncements have been alienated by his methods. For though Chang's tactics have been identical with those employed on several occasions by Chiang Kai-shek, they have not served to inspire confidence in him as a national leader.

The Young Marshal's position has been made even weaker by rumors of international intrigue which have received wide credence as explanations of the incident. The Japanese have insisted that the kidnapping was planned by the Chinese Communists at the instigation of Moscow. The Soviets, on the other hand, have insisted that Japan was responsible for Chang Hsueh-liang's coup. Both offer fairly convincing evidence in support of their contention. The rank and file of the Young Marshal's army have undoubtedly been in close contact with the Chinese Soviet forces, and have been influenced by their anti-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Japanese activities. Yet there is plausibility in Moscow's contention that Japan has the most to gain from the disintegration of the Nanking government. Moreover, as Mr. Stewart points out on another page, certain of Chang Hsueh-liang's subordinates are known to be affiliated with Wang Ching-wei, who was forced to relinquish the premiership because of his open Japanese sympathies.

Both interpretations ignore the very great possibility that Chang Hsueh-liang may have invented the coup himself. This is not the first time that the Young Marshal has resorted to intrigue and gangster tactics to achieve personal ends. The anti-Japanese and pro-Communist items in his demands on Nanking are significant chiefly as a concession to public opinion. During the past few months the All-China National Liberation Association has made startling progress in its campaign for a united front against Japan. There is no evidence that Chang Hsueh-liang was in any way connected with this movement. But it is reasonable to suppose that he hoped to win its support by seizing the man who was most inimical to its program.

Every day that Chiang Kai-shek is held in detention increases the possibility that a genuine anti-Japanese bloc may be formed. While none of the left-wing leaders wish to be involved, even indirectly, in the kidnapping and possible assassination of the dictator, several, including Li Tsung-jen and Pai Chung-hsi, are already urging immediate action against Japan. It is possible that Chiang may win his release on the promise to lead an anti-Japanese war. No one could command more general support. But Tokyo has already warned Nanking against such a compromise, and Chiang's recent decision to intensify the anti-Communist campaign makes that outcome extremely unlikely. China has waited in vain for more than five years for Chiang Kai-shek to lead the resistance against foreign aggression. If his hand is removed from the helm for another few weeks, there is a strong possibility that the country will turn to a new leadership.

The Van Sweringen Empire

NOT since the days of Teapot Dome has the American public been afforded an intimate view of the refinements of high finance such as has been revealed in the recent investigation into the financing of the Van Sweringen railroad system. Beneath the complex structure of holding companies, super-holding companies, dummy corporations, and a myriad of semi-legitimate business interests lay one single purpose: the desire to evade state and federal legislation for the curbing of monopolies. Even with the mass of information which has been revealed, it is difficult to reconstruct the financial structure of the Van Sweringen interests in detail. The Vaness Company was the key to the Van Sweringen empire. It controlled the Alleghany Corporation, which in turn held a controlling interest in seven railroads operating more than 23,000 miles of track, together with coal mines, office buildings, bus lines, and other enterprises with an aggregate value of approximately three billion dollars.

There are many amazing features of the story, but none more inexplicable than the manner in which the Van Sweringen brothers regained control of their empire after having apparently lost it to the Morgans. Having no money themselves, the Van Sweringens persuaded George A. Ball and George Tomlinson to bid for the possession of the Alleghany stock which the Van Sweringens had forfeited to the Morgan banks. After hastily incorporating as the Mid-America Corporation, Ball and Tomlinson obtained this stock, carrying controlling interest in all the Van Sweringen enterprises, for just $274,682. Thereupon Ball drew up a contract permitting the Van Sweringens to buy a controlling interest in Mid-America for $8,250 at any time during the next ten years and to vote the controlling shares in the interim.

The bargain prices which Ball and the Van Sweringens paid for control of the system contrast sharply with the vast sums sunk in the enterprises by the public during the boom period. In 1929 alone $147,000,000 was invested in bonds, preferred stock, and common stock of the Alleghany Corporation. The corporation charter contained a clause permitting the Van Sweringens to spend or borrow without limit, both of which they proceeded to do without regard for the stockholders. Most of the borrowed money, like the original investment, disappeared during the depression.

But the investing public was not the only victim of these financial manipulations. Officials of the R. F. C. testified before the committee that the Missouri Pacific, a Van Sweringen railroad, had obtained $17,100,000 from the government under false pretenses. In applying for R. F. C. assistance, the railroad presented a financial statement in which it conveniently forgot to list an obligation of $20,000,000 to the Terminal Shares, another Van Sweringen enterprise. The Missouri Pacific also carried on its books a substantial deposit with the Guarantee Trust Company which did not exist, and this was shown as an asset in the annual report to the stockholder. Evidence was presented to show that the Interstate Commerce Commission was not notified of the transaction between the Missouri Pacific and the Terminal Shares, despite a ruling that such transactions must be reported, and that the transaction violated the laws of Missouri.

Perhaps we should not be shocked at financial irregularities in high circles. They undoubtedly exist in every phase of our business life. But it is distinctly discouraging that they should be so flagrant in the one field where government control has been developed to the highest degree. Additional legislation might eliminate some of the more serious irregularities but could not obviate them entirely. As long as financial manipulation is profitable, means will be found to evade even the strictest legislation. In an enterprise which is as clearly imbued with the public interest as the railroads, the only solution would seem to be the elimination of private profit.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1936, Farewell

IT IS not hard to say farewell to 1936. It is the custom in leave-taking to speak one's friendliest word, and at the bedside of the dying to cast a final lingering glance. But in these waning days of 1936, as we look back over the now ghostly procession of events, there can be no regret at the year's passing. Every age, of course, has a sense of having passed through a more severe crisis than the previous one, and every year seems to add to a mounting crescendo of doom for the world's culture. But one need not be merely sensitive or humanitarian to feel the terrific impact of the year that is now ending. Even the most hard-boiled political observers bear witness to the stern stuff of which it has been fashioned.

This is the mood in which we make our none too reluctant farewells to 1936. Farewell to a year in which civilization was sustained by the war in Ethiopia, the army coup in Japan, the massacre of Jews in Palestine, and the barbarity of the civil war in Spain; in which international obligations were upheld by the remilitarization of the Rhineland and the rearming of Germany, international honor by the Hoare-Laval treaty, international law by the use of poison gas and the bombing of hospitals in Abyssinia, and by the air raids on women and little children in Madrid, international justice by the abandonment of Ethiopia to the mercies of Mussolini, and international sportsmanship by the farce of the Berlin Olympic games. Farewell to a year of fire-breathing, armament-building, and insult-slinging among statesmen and diplomats—a year in which Sir Basil Zaharoff died but his work went on, a year notable in business annals because airplane stocks soared to a new high and in education because boys and girls were taught to wear gas helmets. Farewell to a year in which the League of Nations sputtered and died, and for it was substituted as the Cerberus of international welfare the armed alliance of Germany, Italy, and Japan. Farewell to a year in which faith was chiefly blind devotion to a *Führer,* hope was the longing eye cast at the rich grain fields of the Ukraine, and Christian charity was the Spanish priest fighting side by side with mercenary Moors, and the Pope's devoted efforts to set up a united front against "communism."

Narrowing our perspective to our own American boundaries we say farewell less grimly but still without much reluctance. Farewell to a year of floods and drought. Farewell to the Black Legion, with its hooded death that sent a tremor of the future through us. Farewell to the Tampa trials, the Arkansas floggings, and Terre Haute's greeting to Browder. Farewell to a year of record army and navy appropriations, plus the pan-American peace jaunt and Mr. Roosevelt's vision of himself putting peace over by chatting casually with the great ones of the earth. Farewell to the bonus melons for past wars and to the Veterans of Future Wars. Farewell to the Black committee telegrams, to the barons of industrial tear gas, to Chowderhead Cohen and the gorillas of the elevator strike. Farewell to the *annus mirabilis* of the Supreme Court—the year when six learned men in robes, Atlas-like, shouldered the American universe and saved the farmer from benefit payments, the coal industry from a measure of stability, and women laundry workers from having to surrender their liberty of contract to the temptation of a living wage.

Farewell, in a different mood, to a year of convention oratory, clogged radios, and Mr. Hearst's campaign wisdom. Farewell to the peculiar American alliance of bourbons and crackpots. Farewell to the Four Hoarsemen —Lemke and his bicycle cap, Dr. Townsend and his lieutenants washing their old-age pensions in public, Gerald Smith booming away and raising Huey Long from the dead three times a day, Father Coughlin sweating unquietly on the platform at Cleveland. Farewell—lest we forget—to Alf M. Landon and the American Way, to John Hamilton my jo, John, to Mrs. Preston Davie and her Women Volunteers, to the Sunflower Special and its entire cargo. Farewell to Mr. Roosevelt dashing around the country with a new repertory of campaign smiles. Farewell, ruefully, to American labor and American radicals dashing after Mr. Roosevelt to save an election that was in the bag. Farewell—and an extra fond and hopeful farewell—to Mr. Funk and the wizards of the *Literary Digest.* Farewell to an election victory followed by WPA lay-offs, and to a business boom that leaves ten million unemployed. Farewell to Ambassador and Mrs. Davies and their oceans of frozen cream. Farewell, finally, to a year in which the most important American export was love and the most beloved American figure a king of England.

But 1936 is more than just a confused jumble of memories. As one looks back on it, it seems (like most years) a year of minor triumphs and major disasters. But, cutting across triumph and disaster, it has been a year in which the human spirit itself has been tested. The heroism shown at the trials of the Austrian Socialists, the agony of the German concentration camps summed up in the broken body and the unbroken spirit of Ossietzky, the unheroic but no less real daily crucifixion of the spirit outside the concentration camps—these have not been lost on the world. The pattern of forces which in Germany led to Hitler have been turned in France into a People's Front. Japan, seeking to follow Mussolini's pattern of conquering first and explaining afterward, has met a formidable opponent in China's millions, for once politically conscious. Soviet Russia has shown that even in the international sphere a nation of workers can act with a decisiveness not given to our own democracies. In America the common man has shown that he is not merely newspaper fodder, and that however far he is still from the political awareness that will lead to a successful labor government, he is no fool. Above all on the battlefields around Madrid the workers have shown the stuff they are made of, and the men of all nations who are helping them reveal that the real International is of those who care for the human spirit.

Which leaves us looking toward 1937 with the same overfond hopes with which we once looked toward 1936. Such, foolish or not, is what Nietzsche calls the "eternal recurrence."

MAX LERNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WASHINGTON WEEKLY

BY PAUL W. WARD

Frank vs. La Follette

Madison, Wisconsin, December 18

WHEN a governor who may some day be the Presidential nominee of a truly liberal and democratic party is accused of trying to oust from the presidency of his state university a man rated as a possible Republican Presidential nominee in 1940, the nation's newspapers at once display an interest in the controversy far greater than they ever exhibit when some obscure pedagogue is fired for preachments discomforting to the plutocrats on whom his college depends for funds. So it is with the current movement to oust Glenn Frank from the presidency of the University of Wisconsin, a movement blamed by Frank's friends upon Governor Philip F. La Follette, who with his brother, Senator Robert M. La Follette, holds the Progressive Party reins passed on by their father, "Fighting Bob." Newspapers whose columns to date have contained no mention of the Jerome Davis case at Yale have given liberal and even front-page space to the Frank case and its developments here at Madison.

Those developments, as reported in the daily press, raise three questions, and the first is: "Does the attempt to oust Frank represent an attack on academic freedom?" It is the only one of the three questions that I feel safe in answering categorically after several days' investigation of the situation, an investigation that has included lengthy talks with Dr. Frank, Governor La Follette, faculty members, students, alumni, local politicians, and business men. There is no question of academic freedom involved. Frank is not under fire for any ideas he has expounded or for any theories of education he has propounded. The anti-Frank faction, which is in the majority in the university's board of regents, does not find fault with anything that Frank has said or written, and his foes readily grant that he, in turn, has never attempted to curb the academic freedom of the faculty or student body over which he presides. The academic-freedom issue, in fact, has not even been raised by Frank's partisans except by the indirect route of charging that the move to oust him represents political interference in the affairs of the university and that if it is permitted to succeed, the university will come under political domination, and academic freedom will be tossed out the window.

This line of argument leads straight to the second question at issue: "Is the attempt to oust Frank a piece of partisan politics?" The pro-Frank faction charges, of course, that the whole business is political. It asks you to believe that the La Follettes are after Frank's scalp for criticizing the New Deal and for threatening to overshadow Phil and Bob as national figures through the prominence he has attained by his lecture tours and radio speeches. It also asks you to believe that the Governor wants the university presidency for himself or for Rexford Guy Tugwell or for Lloyd K. Garrison, dean of the law school and former National Labor Board chairman. But the pro-Frank faction offers not a scintilla of evidence that these things are true beyond pointing out that the regents opposed to Frank are all La Follette appointees and that the move to oust him began last spring when Frank was being mentioned as a possible 1936 Republican Presidential nominee. The anti-Frank faction counters by asserting that the ouster movement is much more than a year old and that while it is true that Frank's foes on the Board of Regents are all La Follette appointees, some of the pro-Frank regents also are La Follette appointees. The La Follette group also points out that it would be anything but politically astute for the La Follettes to attempt to control the university. Persuasive arguments are offered to the effect that the university can never be anything but a political liability to the La Follettes and that the less they have to do with it the better for their political fortunes in Wisconsin.

Then the anti-Frank faction comes through with a counter charge of its own. It asserts that if there is any partisan politics in the ouster movement it has been injected by Frank and his supporters. Harold M. Wilkie, president of the Board of Regents and leader of its anti-Frank faction, has charged formally and in writing that Frank has spread about the country propaganda designed to enlist outside support for himself founded in the belief that he is being made "a martyr to Progressive intolerance," as one young professor scoffingly phrased the case for Frank. A nation-wide propaganda campaign of the sort described has been under way for some months but as yet it has not been visibly linked to Frank. The closest approach to a link of which I have knowledge is that, when the writer of a nationally syndicated newspaper column visited Madison to address the campus journalists, Frank went out of his way to make contact with the visitor, with the result that the visitor devoted his speech the next night and subsequently a column to a thinly disguised defense of Frank and an attack upon his foes as men seeking to inject politics into the university's administration. It is suggested by the anti-Frank faction that Frank had something to do with the fact that Landon during the campaign devoted a rear-platform speech to the university and the necessity for keeping politics out of its affairs.

Frank's foes ask you to note, too, that his chief defenders within the state at the moment are newspaper editors and politicians who have always fought the La Follettes and who until now have been hostile to Frank

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as well. They point out that the leader of the pro-Frank faction on the Board of Regents is a Democrat, Daniel H. Grady, who formerly was intensely critical of Frank. Wilkie charged at Wednesday's meeting of the regents that Grady for a long time had been the leader of the anti-Frank faction and, in fact, had been one of the first regents to propose that Frank be ousted. Grady did not deny the charge but said he had changed his mind. It appears that he changed it this summer at about the time he became a candidate for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination. Grady is a La Follette appointee on the Board of Regents and a lawyer. The rest of the pro-Frank faction on the board is made up of a physician, a housewife, a lawyer, a paper manufacturer, a Lutheran fundamentalist clergyman, and the State Superintendent of Public Education, John Callahan, who is an ex officio member of the board. The clergyman and the physician, in addition to Lawyer Grady, are La Follette appointees. The pro-Frank group contains two Democrats, two Republicans, and three Progressives. The anti-Frank group, composed entirely of Progressives appointed by La Follette, is made up of two lawyers, a housewife who was formerly a teacher, the business manager of the Superior *Telegram,* the president of the Wisconsin Farmers' Equity Union, a Milwaukee labor leader, a farmer who used to be chairman of the Education Committee in the legislature, and a mill hand whose boss is the manufacturer member of the pro-Frank faction on the board.

No discussion of the part that partisan politics may or does play in the ouster controversy would be complete without citation of three other facts. One is that when the university and Frank were being attacked by Wisconsin's home-made Hitler, John B. Chapple, it was not Frank's new-found champions but the La Follettes who defended Frank and the university. It was also the La Follettes alone who defended Frank, while his new Democratic and Republican friends remained silent, when the Hearst press loosed a red-baiting campaign against him. The second fact that needs to be noted is that though the university faculty has always been quick to resent and resist outside meddling in the institution's affairs, at this writing not one member of that faculty has protested against the ouster proceedings. The third fact that needs to be noted is that the ouster movement found its way into print long before the November elections; yet in those elections La Follette carried every ward in Madison by record margins, including the so-called Faculty Ward. It should be noted, too, in this connection that the faculty has never been markedly inclined toward the La Follettes; probably three-fourths of the members of professorial rank are conservative Republicans.

The chief support of the charge of political partisanship was removed on Wednesday when the Board of Regents voted to defer action on Frank's tenure until he has had opportunity to appear before them in a public hearing and answer the charges made against him. Until this vote was taken, the pro-Frank faction had been able to charge that the movement was being carried forward in secrecy to hide the fact that it was a piece of spoils politics. And that brings us to the third question at issue: "Has the ouster movement been secret and has secrecy been necessary because there is no justification for firing Frank?" The answer involves questions of personal veracity. There are no documents available by which one may determine which side is telling the truth on crucial points.

The story of the La Follette camp—which is to my mind unconvincingly contradicted by the opposition—is that such secrecy as was practiced was solely out of consideration for Dr. Frank and at his request. It is, in fact, formally stated by Wilkie that as long ago as last February Frank was warned that his appointment probably would not be renewed at the end of the school year and that he accepted his critics' offer to keep the whole matter secret so that he might get another job, resign the university presidency, and escape dismissal. It is certainly true that Frank was warned last February, and that he was given a list of reasons why his administration was considered unsatisfactory. Whether it is also true that he indicated that he would take the tip gratefully and resign involves one of those questions of personal veracity to which reference has been made. The strongest point in his favor is that, when he carried the issue before the full Board of Regents in March, his foes did not press it. The best reason given for their retreat at that time is that they were afraid of getting the Frank ouster mixed up in the political campaign, especially in view of the fact that Frank was being hailed in New York as a likely Presidential candidate on the strength of his Lincoln's Birthday speech before the National Republican Club. The reason given for the revival of the ouster movement at this time is that the legislature is about to meet and the university will fare better in the presentation of its budget requests for the next biennium if the legislature knows when it takes up those requests that Dr. Frank will not be the one who will direct the spending of the money.

The written charges that Wilkie filed against Frank at Wednesday's meeting of the board were concerned solely with Frank's alleged shortcomings as an administrator. They make little impression on one who is not close to the university's affairs. The indictment they present is that Frank has been a weak and vacillating executive; that his indecisiveness has from time to time brought down upon the university unsavory publicity; that he has tried to play both ends against the middle and in so doing has lost the confidence of his faculty, the regents, and the legislature; that he has promised fiscal and administrative reforms and failed to keep his promises; that he has been so busy with outside activities that he has not had time to master university affairs; that he has broken his contract with the university by continuing to write a newspaper-syndicate column; that he has been extravagant in the maintenance of his household at public expense; and that he has tried to lift the university out of financial troubles at the expense chiefly of the student body and the lower-paid faculty members. There seems to be quite general concurrence within the faculty on the accuracy of these charges, but there is division as to whether they are sufficient grounds for a refusal to renew Frank's appointment as president.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Harry Bridges Comes East

BY LOUIS ADAMIC

FOR two and a half years now Harry Bridges has been a Pacific Coast figure whose honesty, strength of character, intelligence, and general competence as a rank-and-file labor leader have aroused much national and some international interest. Last week, on December 13—the date may be historically important—he stepped into a plane on the West Coast and flew East, and in three days became a national figure.

Bridges's decision to come East was evidently a sudden one, influenced by immediate developments in the maritime-strike situation, and there was no advance publicity. His first meeting was on Monday, December 14, in the Olympic Arena at Philadelphia, where some 1,500 striking seamen, longshoremen, and sympathizers with the maritime strikers gave him a rousing welcome. His coming simultaneously symbolized and actualized the unity of the rank-and-file maritime-labor struggle on the West and East coasts. He explained why the Western sea and alongshore unions had levied a 10 per cent assessment for their Eastern brothers. "We on the West Coast," he said, "have a selfish interest in helping you win your strike against the shipowners. If the employers beat one union they beat all. We have learned that lesson." He told what unity had accomplished on the West Coast. "We longshoremen used to work for miserable wages. We were hired at the same degrading 'shape up' on the docks that you have here, or at company hiring halls. We had the speed-up you have here. Only 2,200 men worked on the San Francisco docks in the days of the speed-up. Now 4,800 men are needed to do the work, and wages average $35 a week. Men are hired at union hiring halls in rotation." This was exciting stuff to Philadelphia dock-wallopers, many of whom are jobless while others work thirty or forty hours at a single stretch without rest.

And this sort of thing, Bridges went on to say, has put "the whole labor movement in the West actively behind us. At a recent meeting of the San Francisco Labor Council the unions donated $18,000 to our maritime strike. If necessary the other unions would go out again on a general tie-up to aid us." More, this militant and successful fight of the West Coast longshoremen for better working conditions has won the support of entire communities, including the city of San Francisco. "Not only labor but farmers and small business men see that their interests are with us as against the shipowners. . . . In San Francisco the city board of supervisors has given support to the marine strike."

On Tuesday, December 15, Bridges was in New York most of the day. He spent the forenoon at the headquarters of the "outlaw" seamen's strike. Then he called on his superior officer, President Joseph P. Ryan of the International Longshoremen's Association, who is also president of the New York City Central Trades and Labor Council and to whom he had previously addressed an open letter accusing him and most of the local I. L. A. union officials on the Atlantic Coast of virtual strike-breaking. He was anything but welcome. In fact, old Joe nearly hit the ceiling and according to newspaper reports called Bridges a "punk," told him he had no business coming East, and discharged him as an organizer of the I. L. A.—obviously for doing his job too well.

That same afternoon Bridges flew to Boston and in the evening addressed the marine and alongshore workers at a mass-meeting in the Franklin Union Institute, also called on very short notice. The Boston *Post* reported the next morning that "a police stenographer present took the text of Bridges's speech but there was nothing in the text that called for criticism." He talked Americanism, called for democracy in the labor movement as opposed to Ryanism and the increasing anti-labor tendencies of the A. F. of L., and encouraged the Boston longshoremen to turn their backs on the I. L. A. misleaders in the East and refuse to handle "hot cargo."

In New York 16,000 maritime workers and other rank-and-file unionists and their sympathizers came to hear him in Madison Square Garden. The rally was inadequately advertised and poorly handled; it was at least an hour too long, but when Bridges, the last speaker, was finally introduced the 16,000 leaned forward not to miss a word.

I have never heard a better organized, more effective, more intelligent, or more sincere speech than Bridges made on this occasion. Speaking clearly and calmly, never at a loss for the right word, he gave a vivid picture of the maritime situation on the Pacific Coast, where he said the federation's strike was already won; and promised workers in the East active cooperation in winning similar victories, once they achieved unity among themselves. He called on the rank and file on the docks in Eastern ports to repudiate the Ryan "leadership." He asserted that he and his movement were not communistic, as had been repeatedly charged (only the day before again by Ryan), unless the C. I. O., President Roosevelt, and everybody else was communistic who believed that workers should not work under degrading conditions.

He made a profound impression. Here was an extraordinary man—intelligent, purposeful, honest, potentially capable of handling almost any situation, physically slight and perhaps not in perfect health, but strong and tough, driven on a straight course by a great passion. As I write this, indications of revolt against the rotten Old Guard in maritime unions are increasing in the East. A National Maritime Federation, which probably was the main purpose of Bridges's trip East and is one of the implicit aims of the current rank-and-file maritime strikes, seems to be assured.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Who's Who in China

BY MAXWELL S. STEWART

THE kidnapping of Chiang Kai-shek by his former ally and supporter, Chang Hsueh-liang, is but another illustration of the difficulty of classifying Chinese militarists according to their political orientation. To an even greater extent than in other countries Chinese politics are primarily a struggle of personalities. The rise of nationalism in the past dozen years has modified but not transformed this pattern. A few of the younger leaders can be pigeon-holed according to their political beliefs, but the remainder fall into cliques and factions which are built almost entirely on personal, family, and sectional considerations.

The Nanking Clique

During the past ten years Chiang Kai-shek (pronounced jahng kai shek) has exercised dictatorial power over the central portion of the country. He has held a number of important political offices, including that of President of the Republic, but his power has rested on his personal control of several of the crack divisions of the army and his uncanny judgment of when to fight and when to compromise. More of a politician than a strategist, he came to power as commander-in-chief of the Nationalist army which swept northward from Canton in 1926-27. But shortly after the capture of Shanghai early in 1927, he turned against his left-wing allies and established a new government at Nanking based on the support of Shanghai bankers and industrialists.

Since the invasion of Manchuria by the Japanese in 1931, Chiang has carefully avoided an open clash with Japan, although on a number of occasions it seemed as if his alleged pro-Japanese sympathies would lead to his overthrow. In order to maintain himself against powerful opposition, Chiang has borrowed the methods of the Italian and German dictatorships. He established a secret terrorist organization, known as the Blue Shirts, as a direct agency of the government for the purpose of stifling anti-Japanese and left-wing agitation. He also instituted the so-called "New Life movement," which sought to revive the ancient Confucian virtues as a substitute for genuine economic reforms. At the time of his capture Chiang was chairman of the Executive Yuan and commander-in-chief of the army.

Chiang's marriage to the politically ambitious Soong Mei-ling nearly ten years ago established what is known as the Soong dynasty at Nanking. His wife's brother-in-law, H. H. Kung, Minister of Finance, has been acting head of the government during Chiang's detention. Kung is an American college graduate who would be wholly undistinguished if it had not been for his marriage to one of the Soong sisters. A brother, T. V. Soong, served with distinction as Minister of Finance for many years, but resigned his post two years ago, presumably because of disgust with Chiang's pro-Japanese policies. Another sister, Soong Ching-ling, Madame Sun Yat-sen, has been Chiang's most implacable foe. Despite the strong Chinese tradition of family loyalty, Madame Sun has repeatedly denounced Chiang for his betrayal of Sun-Yat-sen's political principles. Madame Sun's courageous statements have served as a sort of beacon for the left-wing opposition throughout the years of terrorism.

Outside his immediate family Chiang has had comparatively few lieutenants in whom he could place complete trust. His right-hand man in recent years has been his vice-minister of war, Chen Cheng (chen jung), who was captured with Chiang Kai-shek and is being held at Sian. General Chen has commanded Chiang's most trusted troops in several of his anti-Communist campaigns. If Chen should be executed along with his superior, the scepter would probably fall to General Ho Ying-chin, Minister of War, who formerly served as Chiang's agent in North China as head of the Peiping Military Council. General Ho is the only one of the leaders now at Nanking who is considered capable of occupying Chiang's post. His success would be endangered, however, by the fact that he has no personal army on which he can depend.

North China is under the control of General Sung Cheh-yuan, chairman of the Hopei-Chahar Political Council. Although Sung first distinguished himself by his resistance to the Japanese in Chahar in 1933, his present position calls for humiliating subservience to Japan.

The Left

Almost every Chinese military leader has at one time or another opposed the dictatorship of Chiang Kai-shek, but only a few claim credit for more or less consistent opposition on grounds of principle. Perhaps the best known of this group is Tsai Ting-kai, who commanded the Nineteenth Route Army against the Japanese at Shanghai in 1932. General Tsai headed a revolt against Nanking early in 1934 and was badly beaten. He reappeared, however, this past summer with an important command in the southern province of Kwangsi, and obtained wide publicity because of his refusal to permit Japanese naval authorities to make a first-hand investigation of the murder of a local Japanese shopkeeper. In taking this stand Tsai appears to have had the full backing of the two Kwangsi military leaders Li Tsung-jen (lee tsoong ren) and Pai Chung-hsi (bai choong shee). Li and Pai were leaders of the left Kuomintang in the early days of the Nationalist movement. Driven out of important posts in the north by Chiang Kai-shek, they retired to remote Kwangsi, where they have earned an excellent reputation as capable administrators. Last summer they staged a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bloodless revolt against Chiang Kai-shek which ended in Chiang's complete capitulation. Many observers expect one of these men, possibly Li, the head of the provincial government, to succeed Chiang Kai-shek if the anti-Nanking forces triumph in China. The civilian leadership of the anti-Japanese movement has functioned through the National Liberation movement. Seven of the leaders of this group, including Shen Chung-ju, president of the Shanghai bar association, were recently arrested by Chiang.

Most uncompromising of the anti-Japanese elements have been the Communists. Although little has been reported in the American press regarding the movement of the Chinese red armies, it is known that the principal units are operating in the far western provinces of Kansu and Shensi. Smaller units may be found in at least twelve of the eighteen provinces of China. Mao Tse-tung (mow tzeh doong) is President of the Chinese Soviet Republic and Chu Teh (joo duh) is the military leader.

The Center

In case of Chiang Kai-shek's death the immediate future of China would depend largely on the position taken by four old-line militarists whose actions have consistently proved unpredictable. All have fought Chiang in the past, and all have professed complete loyalty to the Nanking regime. Best known in this country is Feng Yu-hsiang (fung U shahng), the so-called "Christian General," although his Christianity like many of his other hobbies has long since been forgotten. Despite a long record of intransigence, General Feng is now vice-chairman of the National Military Affairs Commission at Nanking, of which Chiang Kai-shek is chairman. He has always been more or less openly anti-Japanese, and in 1933 staged a show of resistance against the Japanese occupation of Chahar (Inner Mongolia). On May 9 of this year, despite his position at Nanking, he issued a statement calling for a strengthening of the anti-Japanese movement, an alliance with the Soviet Union, and a cessation of all activities against the Communists. Although Feng probably has more prestige than any other potential leader of the anti-Japanese forces, he is notoriously unstable in temperament and has the reputation of never finishing the tasks which he undertakes.

Associated with Feng in his bitter struggle against Chiang Kai-shek in 1930 was the veteran Shansi war lord, Yen Hsi-shan. During the past year Yen has cooperated with Chiang in the latter's campaign against the Chinese red army, but is not openly pro-Japanese. Somewhat over a year ago he refused the chairmanship of the five-province state which the Japanese have been trying to create in North China. Like Feng, he is notoriously unreliable but can be counted on to turn up ultimately on the popular side of every issue.

General Han Fu-chu, military governor of Shantung and a former subordinate of Feng Yu-hsiang's, has never played an important national role. His position in Shantung, however, is of great stategic importance. Both the Japanese and Chiang Kai-shek have long had their eyes on this province, but both have been extremely respectful of Han's formidable military machine.

The central figure in the dramatic events of the past two weeks, Marshal Chang Hsueh-liang (jahng shweh liahng), is perhaps the greatest enigma of all. The "Young Marshal" has never been notably progressive in his political ideas, although he is thoroughly modern in many of his tastes and habits. A good tennis player, he was a familiar figure in the smart clubs of the concessions in the days when his foster-father, Chang Tso-lin, was the undisputed master of Manchuria and North China. After the elder Chang had been murdered by the Japanese, he succeeded to power by the simple device of killing his chief rival. Although disinclined to compromise with the Japanese as had his notorious father, he yielded his vast Manchurian empire without serious resistance. His bitterness toward the Japanese is undoubtedly sincere. His new-found sympathy with the Communists is somewhat more questionable, though it is likely that the Communists have made many converts among his subordinates. At the same time some of his aides are known to be in league with former Premier Wang Ching-wei, a former left Kuomintang leader who sold out completely to the Japanese. Wang, significantly enough, has been living in Berlin since his retirement a year ago.

Events move slowly in China, but they move irresistibly. For more than a year anti-Japanese feeling has been mounting in all parts of the country. Chiang Kai-shek has kept it within bounds, partly by terrorism, and partly by appearing to take a somewhat firmer stand against the invader. With his hand removed, we can be reasonably certain that no leader can attain prominence who is not aggressively anti-Japanese. It is possible that no one person can replace Chiang, in which case common hatred of the invader may force the creation of a truly national government representing all factions. With the existing factional differences, such a government could not be permanent, but it could present a formidable obstacle to Japan's continental aspirations.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Solution for Palestine

BY ALBERT VITON

Jerusalem, November 11

TO THE economic difficulties of settling millions of Jews in Palestine must be added conflicting political ambitions and racial and religious differences. The most striking political factor is the rise of Arab nationalism in Palestine. From a mass of half-civilized, restless tribes with no common aim or interest, a self-conscious national entity has developed. The World War, contact with Western imperialism, and most of all the presence of the Jews have brought about this change. In the cities and towns, among the Arab intelligentsia and particularly among the youth, a deep-rooted hatred of all imperialisms now exists. The recent events in Palestine, repeated in essence in Egypt and in Syria, must be viewed as part of a movement sweeping across the Arab world. No foreign power financed the six-month Syrian strike; religion played an insignificant part, and Christians fought side by side with Moslems. The sufferings caused by the strike were borne almost cheerfully. In the strike at Jerusalem, Arab merchants scribbled on their bolted doors: "To Let. Apply at the High Commissioner's." The villagers expressed their defiance in numerous folk songs.

Palestine is still seething, and another strike may break out at any moment. The Arabs are beginning to direct the nationalist flood into constructive channels. They are organizing small industries to shake off their economic bondage to Europe; they are carrying on a fierce boycott campaign against the Jews. The manager of the largest clothing store in Jerusalem told me a few days ago that he had lost more than half of his business. Other Jewish shopkeepers say the same thing. Even more important is the almost complete cessation of the sale of land. No Arab feudal lord dares now to sell a single dunam of land; the peasants never have sold. "The land to those who work it," is the slogan in the villages. "Only thus can selling of land to Jews be prevented."

But the Zionists have not merely to confront the opposition among the Arabs of Palestine. The movement for a united Arabia is gaining momentum. Though conquered and ruled, often tyrannically, by the Turks, Arabia has always been potentially united. The fact that the Turkish Sultan was also, as Caliph, the religious head of Islam took off the edge of the subservience. The Turks tried to give their conquest a façade of pan-Islamism, which often had a semblance of reality. During the World War the Arabs were won over to revolt against Turkey and to give military aid to the Allies by a promise of a pan-Arab kingdom; British airplanes dropped proclamations full of handsome promises. But the Versailles conference set them all at naught. Instead of helping in the unification of a free Arabia, France and England marked out zones of influence, mandates were set up, and Arab states without any real independence were created. To make unity still more difficult, encouragement was given to feudal vested interests and to racial and religious minorities.

Though starving and exhausted from the war, the Arabs resisted imperialist spoliation. The history of *Arabistan* has become a succession of appeals to the League, of riots, strikes, and wars. The impediments to unity laid down by the imperialist powers have been swept away one by one. The minorities of Syria, Iraq, and Egypt are more and more identifying themselves with the Arab majority, and the power of feudal lords and princelings created by the war has rapidly declined. Without the support of British guns, the Emir of Trans-Jordan, whose function is to prevent the union of his country with Iraq, would not last a day.

Arabia is a unity however it is regarded. The same language is spoken, the same newspapers circulate, the same books are read. Modern transportation has helped to unify the far-flung lands. "Before the war," the Egyptian consul in Jerusalem once told me, "we Egyptians had the vaguest notion about Damascus. Today our airplanes go there, we read their papers. That has made a great difference." Economically also the lands belong together, and the rising bourgeois class knows it.

During the recent disturbances in Palestine tens of thousands of dollars poured in from all over Arabia in aid of the Palestine Arabs. Money was collected in Hedjaz and Afghanistan. Demonstrations were staged in Syria and Lebanon. In Iraq the windows of the British residency were broken. Protest meetings were organized in Damascus by the nationalist youth, and the Trans-Jordan youth became so outspoken in their protests that the Emir had to close their clubs and prohibit their uniforms. In spite of the misery which cessation of trade with Palestine brought about, the youth, in support of their striking brothers, destroyed and burned hundreds of trucks laden with vegetables. Young men from all over Arabia joined the rebels in the mountains. The two insurgent military leaders were Syrians.

The deepening of the Arab anti-imperialist struggle and the awakening of the masses constitute the greatest danger to Zionism. Ironically enough, although claiming to be a "movement of liberation" for the native Arab population, Zionism is increasingly forced to play a reactionary role. The Hebrew press tells the imperialist powers to "rule with blood and iron." Weizmann, leader of the Zionist movement, has openly said that the Zionists are "opposed to anything which might lower the prestige of Western powers in the Arab world." The Arabs strongly suspected that Weizmann's interviews

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the head of the French government were designed to influence him against granting independence to Syria.

Even the Socialist Zionists do not welcome the increasing power of Arab labor. The strike wave now engulfing Syria is treated with contempt by *Davar,* organ of the Jewish Federation of Labor. The Histadruth has not been noticeably active in behalf of the Arab workers in Palestine. For many years it has tolerated black Arab labor in the quarries of the Nesher cement works, though not a single Arab is to be found in the factory. These workers, who receive miserable pittances, have struck repeatedly, but the Histadruth has never come to their aid. Every time the Histadruth helped to organize Arab workers it was to "conquer" a place for Jewish workers. At a Histadruth conference Yari openly said: "Organizing Arab workers together with Jewish does not come in place of Zionism, but to strengthen Zionism, immigration, and settlement." For the same reason Zionism has fought and defeated almost every law designed to protect the poor Arab peasant. Realizing that a contented farming population would never sell land, the Zionists have opposed government loans to the fellaheen and have united with the feudal lords in opposition to any law which might decrease the lord's rights over his tenants.

Instead of trying to conciliate the Arabs, the Zionists have relied on England. The Jewish Agency has never desired an agreement with the Arabs. Men who have advocated such an agreement have been called "traitors," and one, De Haan, was murdered in the streets of Jerusalem. The most important Hebrew newspaper, *Haaretz,* said editorially a few weeks ago: "It is a fact which the British government knows perfectly well that the Jews have had more than one opportunity to come to terms with the Arabs, had they been willing to accept the conditions of cooperating with the Arabs of Palestine and those outside against Britain. This condition the Jews rejected. They never made a treaty behind the back of England." Some of the most eminent Jews in Palestine have assured me that an understanding with the Arabs is not impossible. But these men have no influence with the Jewish Agency.

Not only have the majority of Zionists not wanted to come to terms with the Arabs, but they have not even tried to find out what goes on in the Arab camp. As I write these lines I have before me literally pounds of Zionist propaganda, and in all the dozens of pamphlets and books I have failed to find one paragraph on the Arabs. Jabotinsky, the leader of the extreme right-wing Zionists, recently wrote: "My attitude toward the Arabs is similar to my attitude toward any other nation: *polite indifference* [his italics]."

Zionists in general have adopted an attitude of polite indifference toward the Arabs because they realize the strategic importance of Palestine and Britain's need of a loyal group there. Britain has had to get out of Iraq; British power in Egypt is waning; France is being ousted from Syria. The Hebrew press constantly points out that the same thing would happen in an Arab Palestine. Only a Jewish Palestine can defend the route to India. *Davar* published a translation of an article in the English weekly *Palestine* which said: "We are advocating here complete realization of the promise of a national home, not only in justice to the Jews but in the interest of the ideas which Britain represents. . . . Without Jews Palestine is only a part of Syria. . . . Had there been no Zionism in the world, British politics would have had to invent it for military needs alone." Similar articles and editorials have appeared a number of times in *Davar* and in *Doar Hayom,* another Hebrew paper in Jerusalem, and in *Haboker,* a Hebrew daily in Tel Aviv. *Haboker* said: "Now as ever the Zionist movement and the Jewish community in Palestine remain loyal to Great Britain. If many English statesmen do not appreciate the common interests between the empire and us, we do."

But England understands—only too well. And realizing the importance of Palestine, Britain is determined to assure its own future here. For that purpose neither a Jewish Palestine nor an Arab Palestine would be as useful as a divided country, where Britain could keep a permanent balance of power.

Britain's policy during the last eighteen years has not been such as to encourage Zionist hopes. State land which could have been made available for Jewish settlement has been apportioned to rich feudal families. The Jews have been burdened with taxation for the benefit of the Arabs. The government has done practically nothing to encourage and protect infant industries. A jingle very popular with the army here expresses perfectly the government's policy:

> Arab! Don't shoot me
> Shoot the man behind the tree.
> He is a treacherous Jew
> I am Englishman true.
> Arab! Don't shoot me,
> Shoot the man behind the tree.

What, then, is the solution? Certainly there will be no peace in Palestine as long as the Zionists cling to their dream of establishing here a Jewish state. The Arabs will never consent willingly to becoming a minority in such a state. Even were the Jews to achieve a majority in Palestine, the economic and political factors would prevent peace. At best, the Arabs will remain a large minority in a Palestine surrounded by a huge Arab area.

It is said that eight million Jews will eventually be forced to leave Europe. But Palestine offers no haven for all these millions. Even if all political barriers were removed, the country could not possibly sustain such a large population. In my first article I indicated how costly it has been to settle in Palestine the 200,000 Jews who have come since the war. Palestine has been a luxury. It is a beautiful country and the Jews have done wonders here. Not only have they breathed the spirit of life into the desert, but they have reconstructed the ancient Hebrew culture in modern terms. A Hebrew literature has been created and fine poems are being written. The youth, too, is something to be proud of. But fine as these things are, they do not solve the urgent problems of millions suffering in a dozen countries. These people need bread and peace. Perhaps Biro-Bidjan, or Kenya, or some

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unoccupied parts of South America can constitute a refuge for the millions who the Zionists claim must quit Europe. But let the Jews not fool themselves into believing Palestine to be that refuge.

Palestine is the Holy Land, in which the whole world has a stake. It is a land dear to tens of millions of Christians, Jews, and Moslems. To the Moslem Palestine is second in holiness only to Mecca. And the endless stream of Christian tourists from all parts of the world is evidence of the lively Christian interest in this land. But Jewish devotion to Palestine has been greater than either of these. Zionism is the eloquent expression of this devotion, and neither persecution nor marytrdom could keep the Jews away. Never during the 1,866 years which have elapsed since the destruction of the Jewish state has Palestine been without a Jewish community. Though they were few in number, these Jews considered themselves trustees for their whole race and were called "remainder of the community." There is something tragic in the longing of the Jews for the Holy Land. The Jewish exiles to Babylon sang as they sat under a fig tree, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, may I forget my right arm, may my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth," and this terrible oath has been repeated by Jews every day ever since. The Talmud is full of Jewish love for this land: "He who has not tasted the bread of Palestine does not know how bread tastes"; "The air of Eretz Israel maketh wise."

Any just and workable solution of the problem of Palestine must recognize the peculiar character of this small land. But the Zionists are no more disposed to consider the nature of Palestine than are the Arabs. Although they continually stress the "historical connection between the people of Israel and the land of Israel," they do not admit that, by the same token, not only Jews but Christians and Moslems have ancient and inalienable rights. The Zionists want a Jewish state in which the Arabs, the indigenous population, will live as a minority. But if a national state is to be founded here, I believe the Arabs have the most right to it. They have been living here for the last 1,200 years.

However, I am strongly of the opinion that Palestine is not the place for a national state, whether Jew or Arab. Not only the inhabitants but the world outside have interests here. The European Christian community, though more or less passive in the present Jew-Arab struggle, would strenuously oppose either a Jewish or an Arab government. If the Zionists could realize that Palestine is no place for nationalism, the most objectionable feature of the movement would disappear. Boycott of Arab labor is necessary if the Jews are to become the majority, but it loses its *raison d'être* with a change in the political goal. Instead of trying to crush the Arab peasantry, a Zionism without national aspirations would help them. There is no inherent antagonism between the two peoples. The conflict today is not racial or religious but political and economic. I have no doubt that the two peoples could learn to get on perfectly with each other. But because of the political antagonism today only 25 Arab children attend Jewish schools, and only 741 Jewish children attend the government schools, where the language of instruction is Arabic. Without the political antagonism the two peoples could learn both languages, and the way for understanding would be opened.

Suggestions calculated to straighten out the present tangle have been made by Dr. Judah L. Magnes, chancellor of the Hebrew University, by the Orientalist, Nevel Barbour, and by other eminent men. First, since Palestine is no place for the usual kind of national state, some form of international control should be instituted. Possibly government by a commission directly responsible to the League of Nations would be best, or administration might be intrusted to a single nation, preferably one without direct political interests in the Near East. The inhabitants could express their wishes through a democratically elected advisory council, with advisory power only. Administration of village and municipal affairs should be left to the inhabitants. The inhabitants might object to the denial of responsible government, but admitting the principle on which these suggestions are based—namely, that not one race or nation but the whole world is concerned with Palestine—this should not be an insurmountable barrier.

Second, the Holy Land should be strictly neutralized. No nation should use it as a military or naval base. Last autumn, when war threatened between England and Italy, Dr. Magnes wrote in the Manchester *Guardian:* "Palestine would be better engaged in thinking over proposals like that of Mr. Lansbury, that Jerusalem try to become the voice and conscience of the world's religion, than be engaged upon warlike operations, however necessary they may seem to some of the great powers. . . . Palestine should therefore be neutralized by the League of Nations, together with the non-League powers. It would be an indication of unselfishness and of real devotion to the cause of peace if Great Britain, the mandatory power, were to make such a proposal." Both Zionists and British imperialists scornfully attacked this suggestion.

Third, the principle that no group or community should dominate the others should be recognized legally. Not the laws of the land nor the culture nor the social institutions should depend on the numerical strength of any one group. Immigration should be regulated not by political considerations, as it is today, but by the capacity of the country to absorb it. Experts believe that if immigration were permitted to flow naturally, the result would be a permanent population of about three millions, of whom from 45 to 50 per cent would be Jews.

The Zionists would no doubt consider these suggestions foreign to the spirit of the Balfour Declaration and the mandate. The Arabs might also reject them. But many persons believe that only such a system can bring peace to this disturbed country. If the chauvinist ambitions of Jews and Arabs are not checked, more blood will flow, and Palestine will be in the future what it has been in the past, the battleground of nations.

[*Mr. Viton's first article appeared last week. Next week Philip S. Bernstein will discuss the Zionist position.*]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Body Blow for Tammany

BY WILLIAM D. PATTERSON

THANKS to the outpouring of the electorate evoked by the Roosevelt landslide, the nation's largest city was voted a new charter and a system of proportional representation despite the united opposition of the intrenched political forces in the city.

The Democratic bosses and their henchmen in the districts have good cause to be glum. The new charter and "P. R." are body blows for Tammany Hall. These innovations reduce patronage, eliminate jobs, make "favors" more perilous to dispense, make the shakedown of city employees for political contributions more difficult, and strike at the very foundation of Tammany's political hegemony—the geographical division of the city into aldermanic districts, islets of political power ruled with an iron hand from the clubhouses.

The most grievous injury inflicted by the LaGuardia-sponsored charter is probably the creation of a Council of approximately twenty-seven members to take the place of the Board of Aldermen with its sixty-five members. Among the most valuable sheep in Tammany's flock are the sixty-two Democratic aldermen of the existing board. That thirty-five desirable $5,000-a-year jobs and thirty-five faithful members of the party should be thrown into the discard hurts bitterly.

But the charter, which will go into effect January 1, 1938, does not rest there. In another section it provides that "no councilman or other officer or employee of the city shall pay or promise to pay any political assessment, subscription, or contribution under the penalty of forfeiting his office or employment, and shall on conviction be punished for a misdemeanor." That kills the goose that laid the golden eggs for Tammany Hall. Of course elected officials such as the mayor, councilmen, and borough presidents, and appointive officials such as commissioners and clerks, all of whom are at the mercy of the organization, will continue to contribute willy-nilly, but the provision should interfere materially with the flow of thousands of dollars annually into Tammany's coffers from the underpaid civil-service employees.

The Seabury and Todd investigations into New York courts and municipal government were repeatedly checked by a plea of immunity when public officials were being questioned. Avenues of vital inquiry and evidence were blocked by the refusal of the witness to testify on the ground he might incriminate himself. Officials declined to sign waivers of immunity. One section in the new charter states that any officer of the city administration, when so requested, must sign a waiver of immunity and testify before any properly authorized agency of investigation. The penalty for non-compliance is deprivation of office and of the right to be elected to any other public office.

Finally, carefully woven into the texture of the charter are provisions that eliminate overlapping functions and bureaus and by this very fact do away with many jobs.

For proportional representation the Democratic bosses have an even more bitter distaste. Their first objection almost arouses sympathy. As has been said, the charter substitutes a council of twenty-seven members for a board of sixty-five aldermen. On top of that, the mathematics of minority representation through proportional voting so work out that, on the basis of the division of the vote in the 1933 election for mayor, Tammany will be fortunate to elect sixteen of the twenty-seven members of the new Council. The net loss to the Hall is forty-six aldermanic posts. There are now three Republican aldermen on the existing board. Under P. R. eleven of the twenty-seven councilmen will be Republican. Although they cast only about 57 per cent of the mayoralty vote in 1933, the Democrats elected 85 per cent of the Board of Aldermen. Under proportional representation they would have elected only 59 per cent.

The by-product of this enforced loss of patronage is even sadder. The majority of the Democrats on the Board of Aldermen is today so overwhelming that the opposition is powerless. Indeed, the few independent-minded Democratic aldermen seldom trouble to vote in opposition because their votes cannot change the result and they merely incur the wrath of the leaders. But with the balance of power in the new Council likely to be held by three councilmen, votes have an impressive weight. Public pressure will more easily be brought to bear on the new Council, and there will not be the curtain of a sprawling majority to hide behind. In the existing board it is almost too simple to obtain the two-thirds' vote necessary to overrule Mayor LaGuardia's veto. Under P. R. not only will the thinned ranks of the Democrats have to be held in line, but it will be necessary to switch two Republican votes. For once a minority mayor will have some protection in the city's legislative body.

Tammany Hall is chiefly interested in controlling the municipal government. The political complexion of the state and nation is a relatively minor concern. The political machine with which it has dominated New York City for so many years is founded on the district clubhouse, and the glory and idol of the clubhouse is that incomparable stooge of the party leaders, the alderman. The alderman's political strength lies in his natural talent for good fellowship, his unhesitating willingness to take orders, his ability to do small favors, and the fact that he is part and parcel, blood and bone, of the neighborhood inclosed in his district. He is the common denominator of his district, no better and no worse. The party leaders permit him to be elected because he takes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

orders without questioning. He is an asset to the machine by reason of the votes he draws from the people whose parking tickets he has fixed, for whom he has obtained relief, whom he has placed in a small city job, for whom he has persuaded the Mayor to do some trifling favor. No issues are raised in his election. It is solely a question of his personal popularity.

P. R. changes all that. The councilman will be a borough officer. His votes will have to come from every corner of the borough. As a result, Tammany rule, based on the strict geographical division of the city into tightly controlled districts, will suffer a severe set-back.

Clearly, Tammany Hall does not intend to accept the situation established by the charter and P. R. as permanent. What are the leaders planning to do? Their first step will be to try to defeat LaGuardia next fall. Then the city administration will be in their hands when the charter goes into effect on January 1, 1938. Many of the provisions in the charter may be simply ignored. With the municipal machinery established by the document under its control, Tammany will again be able to do business at the same old stand in the same old way.

Legal attacks on the sections of the charter that Tammany does not like will follow. Instituted by Tammany-controlled taxpayers, the actions will be contested by the Tammany-controlled corporation counsel, and will be ruled on by Tammany-controlled judges. There should be no doubt of the outcome. While the entire charter can be upset only by a referendum, vital sections of it can be held illegal by the courts. The clauses compelling waivers of immunity from public officials and prohibiting contributions by city employees will be weeded out. Should Tammany still find the charter an uncomfortable garment to wear, it would hardly hesitate to have the whole thing thrown overboard by a special referendum.

Should these legal attacks fail, it has been decided to try to sabotage P. R. The substantial expense of holding an election under this system, variously estimated at from $400,000 to $800,000, will be steadily criticized by Democrats in the present administration. Then the ballot will be overloaded. In Manhattan alone the Democratic strategists plan to nominate at least fifty candidates. With possibly twenty-five Republican and independent candidates, a confusing ballot will be presented to the electorate. Seventy-five candidates for seven offices! The time consumed in voting a proportional ballot as the voters search the long list of candidates for their first, second, third, fourth, and so on choice will surely result in disfranchising many voters, simply because there will not be time enough for everyone to vote before the polls close. Adding to this irritation, which will be given voice by pro-Tammany papers and Tammany public officials, will come resentment over the long time required to count the votes. Officials of the election board have privately estimated that it may take two weeks or more.

If the Tammany bosses are successful in creating a smoke screen of public indignation by these tactics, they will undoubtedly move for a special referendum on P. R. early in 1938 and defeat it with the clubhouse vote. Let the public beware!

Land for Mexico's Peons

BY L. O. PRENDERGAST

Mexico City, December 12

THE essential dependence of Mexico on the United States has been given fresh and striking illustration by the effect of the Roosevelt landslide on Mexico's internal affairs. It is by now common knowledge here that a Landon victory was to have been the signal for an almost immediate military revolt against the Cárdenas government that would have had the backing of landowners, industrialists, Callistas, the church, and the traditional interventionist groups in the United States, who were counting on a Republican Administration to reverse the Roosevelt policy of "hands off Mexico." The defeat of Wall Street and the Liberty League was equally a defeat for their Mexican satellites and imitators.

It is to the credit of the Mexican government that, though perfectly aware of what was impending, it drove courageously ahead with its program of translating the promises of the revolution into something approaching reality. Two recent measures of President Cárdenas are indications that his progressive drive has by no means slowed down. One initiates vast reform in a rich agricultural region hitherto untouched by the Agrarian Code; the other is a sweeping law empowering the government to expropriate virtually any form of private property for reasons of public interest.

It has long been known that the agrarian legislation introduced by the revolution has not attained its avowed objective of solving Mexico's centuries-old land problem. Even where the laws have been to some extent applied, the paltry results have been wholly disproportionate to the years of blood and agony their adoption cost. Some regions have been substantially exempt from the Agrarian Code because the government was bullied or cozened into believing the landowners' cries that division of their swollen plantations for the benefit of the exploited peons would create chaos in the national economy.

The landowners' fears partly materialized in Yucatan, where the distribution of lands began two years ago in the same haphazard, planless fashion which had in the past brought the whole agrarian program into disrepute. President Cárdenas's determination to split up the Laguna cotton plantations without a repetition of former mistakes opens a new chapter in the agrarian revolution. He found his opportunity in the strike in the cotton

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fields carried out last summer by the landless laborers, who had at last learned the lesson of organization and affiliated themselves with the C. T. M. (Confederation of Mexican Workers). The strike was settled after Cárdenas promised that on October 1 the Agrarian Code would be applied to the Laguna cotton belt. The distribution of lands is now practically complete, and the blow which the landowners had for years averted by clever propaganda and the systematic corruption of local and federal officials has at last fallen. Some 28,500 rural workers and their families have so far received a total of more than 600,000 acres of arable and pasture lands; 155 *ejidos,* or cooperative farming communities, have been organized by the National Bank of Ejidal Credit and more will be created as rapidly as possible.

Most important, for the first time the distribution of land and the organization of *ejidos* have been carried out on a large scale and in accordance with a general plan. Nearly all the agencies of the government are engaged in changing the system of land ownership in the Laguna from that of a few large haciendas employing thousands of laborers into a new order of interlocking cooperative farms; and they are coordinating their various services to establish the new economy of the region on a firm basis. Pure drinking water, public buildings, gardens, playgrounds, athletic fields, and schools are to be provided as quickly as possible after the *ejidos* are organized. Large credit facilities are being made available; 8,500,000 pesos have already been lent to the *ejidos* for seed, work animals, fertilizer, and so on. Tools and agricultural machinery to the value of 1,500,000 pesos have been distributed among them, and orders for additional mechanical equipment have been placed in Mexico and the United States. Technicians and agronomists from the Agrarian Department are stationed in the Laguna to instruct the peasants in modern agricultural methods. The irrigation system depending on artificial wells and the waters of the Nazas River, which was built by private capital, is being enlarged; work on a new dam to insure ample irrigation for the whole region begins in January.

As a further stimulus to the initiative of the *ejidatarios,* democratic controls are being instituted. Both men and women are organizing into leagues for their own defense. For the time being, the Ejidal Bank will carry the accounts and conduct the commercial operations of the *ejidos,* but its trusteeship will be subject to the approval of the peasant organizations, to the annual meetings of which it must render reports. The local judiciary has been dismissed, and new judges, as well as the administrative officers of each new ejidal village, are to elected by the *ejidatarios* themselves.

This is the present plan. How well it will work, only actual experience can tell. There are dangers, of course. Among them is the possibility of sabotage by the big cotton growers, concerned less by the loss of part of their vast acreage than by the loss of exploitable workers, which will lead to labor shortage and higher wages in the cotton fields. Even more serious is the possibility that the government has bitten off more than it can chew. One wonders how long the national treasury will stand the strain put upon it by this and other costly undertakings of the present administration. But the Laguna experiment may fall considerably short of perfection and still be a daring and praiseworthy effort to deal with the agrarian problem in a realistic and thoroughgoing way.

Little space, unfortunately, is left for dealing with the Expropriation Law promulgated on November 25. The bill was introduced in Congress by the President himself, and in spite of the tremendous opposition which it met from chambers of commerce, employers' organizations, and leagues of property owners, was passed in substantially its original form. The law is based on constitutional provisions empowering the government to impose on private property those "modalities" which the public interest may dictate, including total expropriation with indemnification. After listing in its preliminary articles all the various forms of public emergency or need which may make imperative its application, the law subjects all forms of private property to the general exigencies of "public interest."

I suspect that the measure has been adopted more for political than other reasons. It is hardly likely that the government will attempt any immediate widespread application, and the effects of the law will probably be confined, at any rate for the present, to minor matters, such as expropriation of the agricultural machinery of some large hacienda being partitioned under the Agrarian Code. The fact that no protests have come from the foreign embassies suggests that assurances were given in advance that the rights of foreign capital would be respected.

Most of the attacks on the law were concentrated on the question of its constitutionality. The bill's defenders seem confident that there exists full constitutional sanction for its provisions; its opponents claim that the government's right to expropriate was intended by the framers of the constitution to apply only to landed property. The law denies to the person involved all judicial recourse against the expropriation and makes only the amount and terms of payment of the compensation subject to judicial review. Nevertheless, the *amparo* route—what we should roughly term an injunction—is still open to him, and the act will thus be tested whenever an *amparo* brings it before the Supreme Court.

Unlike the nine old men in Washington, the justices of Mexico's highest tribunal are almost unanimously in sympathy with the aims of the government. A test case now would certainly be decided in the government's favor. But this subservience of the court to the executive has grave dangers of another kind. It should not be forgotten that Ambassador Morrow brought the oil controversy between the United States and Mexico to an end in 1927 by inducing President Calles to have the Supreme Court declare the oil legislation unconstitutional. In the event that application of the present law should in the future affect American interests powerful enough to invoke diplomatic intervention, that precedent might be very useful. Such a solution would have the additional political virtue of saving the government's face with labor, which has given unconditional support to the new law.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Issues and Men

BY OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

Education or Politics

THE case of Glenn Frank, at this writing in danger of being ousted as president of the University of Wisconsin, is of nation-wide importance because what is involved is the political control of a great state university. The fact that the Governor who is responsible is a liberal and a progressive and bears the honored name of La Follette makes it the more important. When a progressive or a liberal in office undertakes to dominate automatically a given academic situation, it is the duty of liberals and progressives everywhere to join in the protests certain to arise. If liberals cannot live up to their standards when in office, then there is very little hope for the progressive movement in America.

Now I am well aware that some of the points made against Glenn Frank are valid. He is not of the scholarly type. Before his appointment his experience in university affairs was limited to a period as assistant to the president of Northwestern University, and that was nine years before he was chosen to be president of Wisconsin, at which time he was editor of the *Century*. It is true that his mind leans to compromise, more so than he himself realizes, I am sure, and that he dislikes to take unequivocal stands in academic or non-academic controversies. Hence it is impossible to characterize him either as a liberal or as a conservative. But these facts about Glenn Frank were all patent *when* he was appointed. He had then set forth his views in a series of editorials in the *Century,* and as perhaps the highest-paid lecturer in America his habit of balancing the arguments pro and con in every controversy was well known. It is true also that just because he is not a trained scholar his intercourse with the faculty has been limited; I think that he and his wife are frankly more interested in men and women of affairs and social distinction than in their own faculty. It is also undeniable that they made tactical social mistakes on going to Madison and that the community gained the impression that President Frank felt that for him the University of Wisconsin was to be only a stepping-stone to a higher sphere of activity.

All this must not obscure the fact that the university, as Mr. Frank points out, was ranked seventh in the country in graduate work when he became president, and is now ranked second. Nor should his known weaknesses lessen denunciation of the methods utilized to oust him. The ouster was sponsored in the office of Governor La Follette—that is admitted—and not with the Board of Regents. No effort was made to sound out the alumni or the faculty, and it was actually intended last spring, and again this winter, to fire President Frank at a secret meeting without really giving him a chance to know what the charges against him were or an opportunity to defend himself. These charges were not formulated until the meeting of December 6, and I do not think they would have been published then except for the public outcry against the secret, star-chamber method of railroading Mr. Frank out of office. Now at least we have the six charges on paper. If they can be proved, then the question of whether the time has come for the president's retirement can properly be faced. It certainly ought to be possible to establish once and for all whether he has mismanaged the university's finances, whether he has lost the confidence of his faculty, whether he is "without the primary qualities essential in the administrator of a university," and finally whether it is true that he has permitted the expenditure of too much public money upon himself and his household, in addition to his $18,000 salary and his allowance of $2,400 toward the expense of living in the large house willed to the university as a presidential residence.

Whatever the outcome, it will be a grave misfortune if the affair does not result in a determined effort to divorce this unfortunate university from political control. If that is not done, it will be impossible in the future to get a first-class man to occupy the presidency, and we shall have a repetition of what has been going on for years—the packing of the Board of Regents by men and women of the political faith of the Governor who happens to be in office, a practice no more justifiable when done by a La Follette than by a Kohler, or a John C. Spooner, or any kind of Republican Stalwart or Democratic partisan temporarily in office. As Mr. Frank has himself said, the issue now transcends his personality. It is simply whether or not a university, created and supported by the state, shall be under political control; whether or not a president duly chosen shall be subsequently ousted as a result of gubernatorial initiative. It will be a great blessing if as a result of this storm a system can be worked out by which teachers of all ranks may be allowed to have something to say in the government of the university whose reputation and progress rest primarily in their hands. There is no more crying need than this, as the disgusting situation in Yale in connection with the dropping of Professor Jerome Davis also shows. There must be faculty representation upon boards of trustees so that they shall have some control over the conditions under which they work, intellectual freedom, and security of tenure. Let us have a showdown in Wisconsin. Let us get a few of these things into the open. Besides doing full justice to President Frank, let us make impossible further political control of the university's affairs.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BROUN'S PAGE

Down to the Sea in Haunted Ships

ONE of the difficulties of trade unionism is the fact that in many strikes it fails to gain public sympathy. Even when it has an opportunity to make its case clear, the sympathy of the public may not be of much practical benefit. If every reader of *The Nation* agreed not to buy a single steel rail until the industry was organized, such a boycott would help John L. Lewis very little. Of course, there are labor situations in which the consumer can help enormously in the winning of a strike. The Newspaper Guild, for instance, is fortunately situated in that reader response has such a vast effect upon daily papers and other publications.

One of the most important labor conflicts of recent years is now in progress along the waterfront, and the public has an opportunity to play its part. As a matter of fact, the striking sailors can do more than appeal to the sympathy of the public. They can appeal to its self-interest. Aside from twinges of conscience the housewife who goes through a picket line into a grocery store may not suffer very greatly. The canned goods she buys are just the same as they were before the strike was called. She runs the risk of remorse, which seems to me a not inconsiderable fact, but she is not in danger of losing life or limb.

The seamen's strike brings up an entirely different factor. A scab ship is certainly not a pleasant vessel on which to travel, and it is also likely to be highly unsafe. One can hardly expect great skill, courage, or devotion from strike-breakers on the sea or elsewhere. The man who sells out his own craft for pay is hardly the person upon whom one would like to rely in a time of crisis. Good working conditions on shipboard are of vital interest to the passenger. He pays for good service and he isn't going to get it if the crew is badly housed, badly fed, and overworked.

There has been much talk lately of slum clearance, and now some of the worst slums are to be found in the floating palaces of the Atlantic and Pacific. New construction has not meant better quarters for the crew. The tendency has been almost the reverse. The more luxurious the liner, the more valuable becomes every cubic foot within the hull of the vessel. And so owners intent on profit skimp the space of the crew more and more.

I suppose there is nothing like a luxury liner for the creation of class consciousness. Some years ago I was on a cruise, and by some coincidence or other I happened to get quite chummy with one of the bar stewards.

"I'm an anarchist," he said, "and I suppose I may shock your bourgeois notions about chivalry and a sailor's duty to go down with the ship."

"Go ahead and shock me," I answered. "I ought to be able to stand it, I'm supposed to be a newspaperman."

"Well," he explained, "if the Communists and the Socialists had any sense, which they haven't, they would work for subsidies for passenger boats, particularly the fancy ones. There's nothing like a liner to class-angle human life. That's where you get the strictest caste lines and the holy folk and the untouchables. The passenger always looks rich, whether he is or not. Naturally the crew don't like it. There he sits on the small of his back drinking beef tea while the sailor is scrubbing brasses. You know it's a rule of the sea that when there is nothing to do the officers have to invent something. So here's a fellow working hard at something perfectly useless and looking at a bunch of reclining passengers who are even more useless then that.

"And of course the sailor is likely to say to himself, 'Those are the passengers—the guys who speak up when anybody says anything about sharing the wealth. And whose answer always is, "Oh no, we've got the wealth." '

"Maybe sometime something happens to the ship, and then those same fat passengers are yelling around about sharing the lifeboats, and it is just possible that the crew might say, 'Oh no, we've got the lifeboats.' "

The anarchist bartender didn't shock me very much because I am familiar with the exaggeration of that school of thought. As a radical I naturally deplore the sentimentality of the anarchists, and yet underneath their romantic notions there sometimes runs a thread of truth. It is not a healthy thing for passengers to travel on a ship which flaunts the luxury of one class in the face of a group which is palpably underprivileged. I am referring, of course, to the health of the passengers. A ship requires teamwork of the closest kind, and this can be achieved only through the acceptance of trade-union principles.

The fight about control of the hiring halls is a vital and perfectly simple issue. If the owners may designate the same groups over and over again and leave the rest in the cold, no union can survive. It will be argued on the owners' side that the choice is made wholly on the basis of efficiency, but since this is a profit-making world one may be inclined to scoff a little at this explanation. So long as the employer has the power to disrupt organization by favoring one clique at the expense of another he is likely to avail himself of the privilege.

I've said that the maritime strike is an important one for the public. It is critical in labor history, for the principle of industrialism as against the craft set-up is now being tried out in the laboratory. If Ryan wins over Bridges, it will be a victory for the employers. It will encourage them to pursue the traditional tactics of fighting labor with labor. I'm a timid man about the ocean and its dangers, and when I go down to the sea in a ship I want to be the guest of a happy little family and not a visitor in a house both haunted and divided.

HEYWOOD BROUN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS *and the* ARTS

DISCIPLINE FOR GERMAN WRITERS

BY KLAUS MANN

RECENTLY Dr. Joseph Goebbels, German Minister of Propaganda, and Councilor of State Hanns Johst, German writer, president of the Poet's Academy, and friend of the *Führer,* let themselves be heard again on the subject of German literature. "Not another day will we tolerate having the nation read German authors who reveal an indifferent attitude or who show secret reserve toward the doctrine of National Socialism, or who live abroad. The end has come for these despicable writers; they shall no longer be permitted to poison German hearts. We, Goebbels and Johst, will attend personally to the disappearance of these writers from the sphere of public interest. We will do everything possible in order that the German public may read true and actual Nazi authors." Thus, or similarly, the German minister and the German poet spoke, and accompanied their speeches with many insulting thrusts against the indifferent or undecided writers of the Third Reich.

The representatives of Nazi literature—and consequently government officials and officially recognized writers like Johst—are enraged that the books of the emigrant German authors are preferred abroad to works produced in the Third Reich. I do not believe that the reasons for this attitude of the public outside Germany are predominantly political. Most people, in New York or in Zurich, in Paris or in Rio de Janeiro, simply find the works of Thomas Mann or Stefan Zweig, of Lion Feuchtwanger or Franz Werfel more interesting than books by Kolbenheyer, Ponten, or Johst—names which are quite unknown outside Germany. The international successes of émigré German authors, such as Vicki Baum or Emil Ludwig, are a constant cause of embitterment to authors still living in Germany. The Ministry of Propaganda has dumped German literary products on the international market at a price from 25 to 30 per cent less than the same books cost in Germany. But despite this practice, the sale of books which come from Germany continues at its former low figure abroad.

Moreover, in Germany itself the public favors and demands the books of those authors who are not completely coordinated. This demand can be effective of course only for "Aryan" and politically neutral writers, since the works of Jewish and left-wing authors are forbidden. Particularly striking is the popularity of an author like Hans Fallada, who formerly belonged to the moderate left and is today emphatically non-political. His success in Germany is to be explained in part by the circumstance that he is not a Nazi. A great moral prestige, particularly among German youth, is enjoyed by certain conservative authors who are known to be definitely nationalistic but not Nazi; to this group belong Wiechert, Hans Carrossa, and Ricarda Huch. All these writers are much preferred to those of the avowed "coordinated" camp. A special attraction for the more exacting literary public is also exercised by those few writers who no longer live in Germany but whose works could until recently be published and read there. Thomas Mann is one of these. My father lives in Zurich, but his books appeared in Berlin until January, 1936. Although they were not allowed to be much advertised or discussed in the press, they were far more widely read than the works of most Nazi writers.

The irascibility and aggressiveness noted in those circles which bear the responsibility for Nazi culture may be understood when one considers that the Nazis themselves, during their rule, have not produced a single author who enjoys international or even great national fame. With regard to stage and screen the situation is no better. Within the last few years German films have suffered almost complete loss of their international appeal, and in German cities the theater is no longer an outstanding attraction. Doctor Goebbels himself is in despair. He complains and uses abusive language. He arranges prize competitions for young dramatists, but all to no avail; and the poor theater director of the Third Reich must have recourse to old farces or to the few classics in whose works no trace of "despicable" convictions is to be found.

It is now a question whether anything of Germany's cultural life will remain after Goebbels's latest decrees have been carried into effect. Will it still be possible to stage a play of Gerhart Hauptmann's? To be sure, the old and enervated author of "The Weavers," makes every conceivable effort to be on good terms with the present regime, but we all know that at the bottom of his heart he is far from being a Nazi. Therefore does he not also belong to that group which is to be exterminated and silenced? In any case Thomas Mann belongs to this group, and it is a fact that his latest book, the third volume of the Joseph series, cannot be sold in Germany.* And now must vanish those last journalistic retreats for the comparatively liberal spirit, those last oases in the desert of German "coordinated" culture—the feuilleton of the *Frankfurter Zeitung* and the literary review of the *Neue Rundschau,* which have been dull and reactionary but not, until recently, completely pro-Nazi.

A people which is soon to serve as food for cannon must first be dulled to the point of stupidity. The Ministry of Propaganda, together with the press, is doing everything in its power to hasten this process.

* Since I wrote this article Thomas Mann has been deprived of his citizenship by the German government, and now all his books are forbidden and confiscated in Germany.—K. M.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LUIGI PIRANDELLO

BY DELFINO CINELLI

THE last time I saw Pirandello—some three months ago—he was as vibrant as ever but perhaps somewhat more nervous than usual; perhaps his face was a trifle paler. He was not happy—not that he was ever what one might term gay, but usually his profound kindness and his simplicity spread around him a serenity which was now missing. Life had been cruel to him, but he would confess only that he was saddened by the fact that his works were so often misunderstood or not understood at all, despite the fact that he was striving with all his might to make his message plain to all.

He was bitterly hurt by the superficiality of those critics who, while admitting the originality of his thought and his gifts as a dramatist, branded his work as cerebral, cold, and abstruse. The accusation may have been due partly to his aloof treatment of the tragic element; he controls so effectively his emotional intensity that his detachment often takes on the grimacing mask of a clown. A greater offense was the common assertion that his plays are concerned with ideas and ideas only. This is an interesting delusion. Pirandellian heroes never discuss themselves. Their tragedies are obscure to themselves as well as to the audience, but they are composed of the primitive stuff of which life is made. The search for that obscure reality, the mystery of personality, the Hamletian doubt, is at the source of his work, not as idea but as the flesh and blood of his characters, as the main element of the tragedy of man. In fact, his great achievement, or rather—if one can use the word in connection with works of art—his discovery, was to reveal that since these metaphysical abstractions are at the root of life and therefore at the root of human emotions, they are also dramatic—in fact, the essence of human drama—and belong to the theater, provided of course one can give them concrete life.

This he undoubtedly has done more effectively than anyone else either before or after him. That is why he could assert, as he passionately did on the least provocation, that he had lived and suffered every word of his writing, every act of his characters. Of course he could not avoid the charge of obscurity, which is brought against any artist who goes a step beyond his readers; yet the deeper one delves into his work, the more difficult it becomes to explain how the charge could be so widely applied to so human and sensitive a writer.

A criticism which did not bother him much was that expressed by pedants to the effect that his form and language were often careless. It is evident that in striving to make his message living, elegance and purity of form became the last of his considerations. Had he chosen to present one of these pedants in a play, he would have assigned to him the appropriate idiom. But there was still another charge which had the power of stirring within him a deep resentment and perhaps some lingering doubt, the doubt which probably goes with all sincere creation: his art was often said to be merely negative. "If to abate hypocrisies, commonplaces, and the obsolete obstacles to truth is to be negative, then my work is negative," he would burst out with his cold, incisive intensity.

Nevertheless he could not hide from himself the fact that, having posed more effectively and more concretely than anyone else the problem of the secret reality of human life, he had not solved it. Perhaps his answer was that the secret purpose of life lies even in the search for it, in the striving for supreme sincerity. He had still much to convey to us. He said so himself but a very short time ago. But he added: "What can be the use of talking to men in times of such materialism and hatred and strife? Men do not want to listen. . . ."

BOOKS

New Rhetoric for Old

THE PHILOSOPHY OF RHETORIC. By I. A. Richards. Oxford University Press. $1.75.

TO READERS unfamiliar with Mr. Richards's earlier works these lectures are likely to seem fragmentary, limited in their preoccupations, and indefinite in their assumptions. Their purpose is to point the way toward "a persistent, systematic, detailed inquiry into how words work that will take the place of the discredited subject which goes by the name of Rhetoric." Mr. Richards is concerned with such specific matters as the definition of words, their interrelationships in the context, and the nature of metaphor. And both his tone and method are so polemical as to make the hasty reader believe that he is involved in nothing more serious than a grammarian's squabble. But this is because Mr. Richards was hardly able, within the limits of a few short papers, to do justice to the whole long career of thinking and experimentation that lies behind his present absorption with words. A few eloquent but undeveloped statements, a few ominous hints, and a few knotty quotations from Coleridge were probably all that reminded his Bryn Mawr listeners that behind his discussion of words lies a whole philosophy of rhetoric, and behind this in turn a whole philosophy of the universe.

What Mr. Richards failed to make perfectly clear in six lectures is even more impossible to make clear in a single review; and it will have to be enough to raise one or two points about the possible value and consequences of the inquiry that he has here undertaken. Accepting without trouble the intuition which Mr. Richards shares with Coleridge that the literary work may best be compared to a plant, of which words would be the "parts and germinations," we may ask whether it is really possible to construct a "discussible science" that will formulate, like any proper science, the exact laws of its genesis, growth, and fruition? Is it possible to raise our "implicit recognitions" into distinctions so explicit that they may be imparted to others, presumably by school teachers to their pupils? This is the most general question that the book forces to the mind, and Mr. Richards's answer is to match his quotations from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Coleridge with others from Bacon and Hobbes to the effect that the end of knowledge is power.

But another way of discovering an answer is to consult Mr. Richards's own practice, where it will be noted that he is uniformly more engaged in showing us what rhetoric is *not* than what it is, where the approach is consistently negative. Much of the book is necessarily directed against various ancient and modern theories—the "proper usage" criterion for words, meaning as onomatopoeia, and the treatments of metaphor offered by Hulme, Breton, and Eastman. Here Mr. Richards is the brilliant and nearly always convincing dialectician. But let us look at some of the formulations set up against these exploded notions—the definition of words, for example: ". . . . what a word means is the missing parts of the contexts from which it draws its delegated efficacy." The "context" is a cluster of recurrent events in the mind; the word is "delegated" to take over the duties of parts which can then be omitted from the recurrence. The only trouble with this definition is that neither the context nor the process of abridgment by which a part stands for a whole can be established; we come up against "the limits of knowledge." The same impasse is struck when we consider the interrelationships between words in a given literary context, what is here called their "interinanimation." This excellent new term enables us to label a phenomenon but it does not unfold the principles of its operation. Similarly, after breaking down the metaphor into a "tenor" and a "vehicle," Mr. Richards is forced to admit that the relations between these two cooperating uses are limitless, that their interpenetration is of the integral and organic character of life itself. In his handling of each of these problems he actually gives the effect of proving just the opposite of his thesis. He convinces us rather that since every rhetorical unit has meaning only in relation to a particular context, and since every context is really a unique event, no single set of generalizations as to "how words work" can possibly be drawn up.

This is not to deny the value of his criticism, which will continue to be, on its strictly negative side, of extreme service to contemporary writing. It is only when he insinuates that scientific method can conjure up a new rhetoric on the ruins of the old that the dry wind of Alexandria seems to blow through his pages. It is only when his disciples write studies entitled "The Seven Types of Ambiguity" and then illustrate all seven types in their verse that the dangers of his method are revealed. In brief, it is only when he introduces the scientific criterion of "use" that his criticism becomes something different from the unique interpretation of a unique literary event. On its negative side, his criticism constitutes a warning not only to students of literature but to everyone who uses language for purposes of communication. In its emphasis on the organic nature of communication, on the relations of words to a whole, and on the relation of this whole to the whole of our mind and personality, it should prevent us from falling into those "springes and snares" that Donne warns about in detaching sentences from Scripture. Above all it should discourage us from even contemplating the possibility of a new Manual of Rhetoric.

The real contradiction in Mr. Richards's position, if one had time to examine it, would prove to be between a philosophy that is intuitive, contemplative, and organic and one that is experimental, pragmatic, and mechanical. As Coleridge put it, without necessary qualifications, it is the difference between Plato and Aristotle; and no more than Coleridge himself is Mr. Richards likely to effect the reconciliation. If he follows Coleridge in his interpretation of literature, he follows Bacon and Hobbes in deciding that something must be "done" with this interpretation; and these influences stand for opposite directions of the mind. It is this tension, however, that makes Mr. Richards one of the liveliest, most stimulating, and most rewarding of contemporary critics.

WILLIAM TROY

Purse of Empire

BACK TO MALAYA. By R. H. Bruce Lockhart. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $3.

THIS time the British Agent travels under his own commission. Six years are a good many for an itching foot, even a canny Scotch foot, to be tied to a news desk, and Mr. Lockhart is in his late forties, an age when many men of less adventurous disposition decide that they must stop the grind and find, or recapture, their youth before arthritis makes the pursuit forever impossible. So, Mr. Lockhart tells us and tells himself, he got leave from his job with the Beaverbrook press to go to Malaya, the scene of an early romance and the home of gorgeous sunrises and virile builders of empire. But fortunately for the reader, Mr. Lockhart protests too much; he is not just another adolescent of forty; the nose for news developed during his service in Russia and Central Europe is too much for him, and his observations on the Malay possessions and Java make important reading at a time when it is not the star of Bethlehem rising in the east.

"Taken together," Mr. Lockhart says, "the Straits Settlements and the Malay States are, for their size, the richest of all Britain's overseas possessions"—and the most remunerative to British stockholders. Control of their tin, rubber, tobacco, and other products has been skilfully held against all comers. Steaming into Singapore after an absence of twenty-five years, Mr. Lockhart saw concrete testimony to the development, and protection, of imperial wealth—oil tanks on the hill, airplanes overhead, destroyers all around, ponderous fortifications at one end, and, in the city, modern office buildings. The perennial interest of the British in sports and the country around the Pantai village of his early romance were the only things unchanged. Routine administrators directed by absentee corporations in London had replaced the virile empire builders; in the hotels refrigerated foods were served from all parts of the world and cabaret entertainers from Austria and Russia beguiled the guests; the old dens of iniquity had been cleaned up. Chinese everywhere, outnumbering British and Malays two to one in many settlements. Few Japanese, but imports of Japanese goods and exports to Japan—through Japanese concessions—of iron and ilemite, used in the production of titanium tetrachloride, guarantee to the Dutch that the British will not quarrel with them over their possessions in these waters. Amai, now married, had changed too, although less than most Malay women. Mr. Lockhart went on to Java with its 40,000,000 inhabitants. The problem noted here is one too long ignored in our own Hawaiian territories—a growing number of educated young people of mixed blood, eager to find work for which they are fitted but because of discrimination or industrial depression unable to find proper employ-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment; only a few rise to minor administrative positions. In Java as in Malaya, Chinese in city and country; again, not many Japanese but cheap Japanese goods, which, the Dutch administrator said, they had been glad to allow during the depression because otherwise the natives could not have bought anything at all and might have risen.

If the British imperialist rises to the surface every so often in Mr. Lockhart's story, the trained observer corrects the bias as far as temperament will allow. The Dutch administrators, he admits, are better educated and more cultured than the British—although the horrors of Dutch conquest are remembered when the British are forgotten. There is some nostalgia for the good old times, a little veiled prejudice—note the story of the Chinese towkay who kept his feet on the desk during the author's call. Characteristically, he comes to no definite conclusions—empire is probably bad, but on the other hand . . . We have to thank him, however, for a colorful and readable presentation of facts that events are making more important every day, and he has written the first account of Bali I have read that makes the place more than a stage set for Mr. Grauman's Chinese theater.

Mr. Lockhart did not find his youth. Some men never know they have lost it; when they are mature enough to know that it is gone, it is—gone. And Mr. Lockhart is mature; he found many things to think about. The white man, Conrad's Malay said, "is stronger than the wild beasts, but not so wise. A black tiger knows when he is not hungry. You do not."

B. E. BETTINGER

Sterile Love

MAIDEN CASTLE. By John Cowper Powys. Simon and Schuster. $2.50.

NOBODY in a novel by Mr. Powys is ever as interesting as the author himself. Many remarkable things are happening, and a gallery of grotesques presses its walls perilously upon the reader as he passes; but at any moment he is likely to be thinking less of the actions and the characters than of the man who could have contrived them. That unhappy figure is always hugely in the way, pushing people around, straining them into appropriate attitudes, forcing their relationships, producing sound effects of wind and thunder to eke out their rather toneless voices, and gesticulating to the reader lest he miss some cosmic irony which is about to express itself. Nor is Mr. Powys anything but truly interesting. It is simply that his best book is still his "Autobiography," which is completely and frankly about himself.

He is perhaps no novelist at all. To me he tragically lacks the gift of being credible—tragically, because he has so many other gifts in the richest abundance. He has eloquence, imagination, and a unique vision of the universe. He has the kind of humor which comes from looking at things and people through prisms, so that the gray light for him breaks constantly into color. He has a feel for the world. And yet he cannot tell a story which I will believe. He is always getting ready to do so, he is forever maneuvering the battalions of his words toward some strategic point. He is a master of preparation, a potent suggester of mysteries to come. But the mysteries are fizzles, the events are overprepared. This seems to be because Mr. Powys lacks any sort of gumption about what is plausible. He spoils his suspense by having too much of it and by talking too much about it. He slows down his action almost to the stopping place by keeping too many actions simultaneously before our eyes. Where all is supposed to be wonderful, nothing can be genuinely so; where all is grotesque, nothing can be strange.

And this is not at all because Mr. Powys lacks vision. The world he is groaning to give us does exist. But it exists in his own mind, and he has never been able to get it out. It is art that he lacks—the art of projecting his soul into people unlike himself, people who know how to act as if they had never heard of John Cowper Powys. This may or may not be the penalty of his having waited too long to become a novelist. Doubtless there is something in the theory that a man's art should grow up along with him, taking body as he does, and hardening through the years into a universe as visible to us as to him—a universe, furthermore, the meaning of which is possibly less important than the delightful fact of its existence. In such a case the artist himself knows none too well what his stories mean; he merely knows that these people did these things because he saw them doing them, as we may also. It may or may not be true that Mr. Powys has brooded too long in British and American solitudes, building a philosophy inside himself which a belated art will never catch up with. At any rate, in "Maiden Castle" no less than in "Wolf Solent" and "The Glastonbury Romance" he has written a novel which ought to be more important than it is.

The scene as usual is the southwest of England, and as usual the people have preposterous names—Wizzie Ravelston, Teucer Wye, Thuella Wye, Enoch Quirm, Mr. Urgan, and so on. The hero, a lonely novelist of picturesque habits and inexpressible visions, is nameless; or rather he calls himself No-man, partly because he does not know who his father is and partly in the attempt to affirm his unique position as spectator of the vast universe's goings-on. And the theme is "sterile love," which No-man and Quirm set forth in numberless lengthy speeches as the driving force of existence. "Rampant desire unfulfilled—why," says Quirm, "there's nothing it can't do! Stir up sex *till it would put out the sun* and then keep it sterile! That's the trick." It is only through "hopeless desire" and "frustrated love" that we can "break through," they keep on howling while the wind whines in the chimneys and Maiden Castle outside the town hugs the ghosts of old Welsh gods to its moldy bosom. This ought to be interesting, but unfortunately it sounds like nonsense, and for the simple reason that No-man and Quirm never come into being. A similar notion in the "Autobiography" was interesting because we got it straight from Mr. Powys himself. Here in the mouths of dummies it is ghastly. It is Mr. Powys fumbling at the keyhole of nature, hopelessly desiring entrance.

MARK VAN DOREN

Two Thinkers for One

THE MIND AND ART OF JONATHAN SWIFT. By Ricardo Quintana. Oxford University Press. $3.75.

THE MAGIC PLANT. By Carl Grabo. University of North Carolina Press. $4.

SHELLEY and Swift do not occur readily to the mind as making one of those striking parallels that the history of literature occasionally affords. Shelley, the ineffectual angel, and Swift, the gloomy Dean, are in fact antitheses. Yet at the outset of the studies of these men that have just appeared we find a warning and a hint that our current

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

judgments of these two are largely false. Mr. Quintana and Mr. Grabo, writing independently of each other, use almost identical words to gain our open-minded hearing: "No English writer of corresponding stature," says Mr. Quintana of Swift, "has been repudiated so persistently and so fiercely"; and he goes on to assert that the fierce repudiation has been due to misrepresentation. "Shelley," according to Mr. Grabo, "has never been wholly understood; has indeed, for the most part, been thoroughly misunderstood."

To be sure, many readers, unprejudiced by Samuel Johnson and Thackeray, have always been able to discover in Swift something else than a sour hatred of humanity backed up by a morbid fondness for scatology. The life and letters of the man furnished a clue to his rational idealism, his warm-hearted understanding of the goodness and weakness of men. But as late as D. H. Lawrence's preface to "Lady Chatterley's Lover," Swift's philosophy was misinterpreted as evasive puritanism, and the common estimate of his genius tended to class him as one of those minute but powerful critics, very much of their age, who speak to us by virtue of their clear enunciation rather than of any profound meaning. That "Gulliver's Travels" should have become a classic for children is a fair measure of the misinterpretation. Misguided foreigners, like Goethe, seemed to overvalue the satirist, and we preferred the "gentle" irony of Chaucer to the savage indignation of "A Modest Proposal" in the mistaken belief that Chaucer knew and loved mankind more truly than did Swift.

Mr. Quintana's scholarly study gives us grounds to change all that, but it may be questioned how soon the historians of literature and the general public will veer round. The ostensible subjects of Swift's truest expressions repel most moderns; his verse is appreciated by very few, for it looks like doggerel and most editions of it contain more expurgatory dashes than solid rhymes. Lastly, Swift's views on science are not flattering to our prejudices or even clearly ascertained. Mr. Quintana is still of opinion that Swift despised science and had a "negative philosophy of history," that is, a non-evolutionary one. It seems to me possible to hold that Swift was making a criticism of the claims of science as necessary in our day as it was at the beginnings of the Royal Society. But soon or late there will come a time when Swift's stature will be more accurately gauged in accordance with the facts. Misjudgments are largely due to conscious or unconscious suppression, and moreover our age seems well circumstanced to grasp the principle of Swift's thought, a principle that Chamfort gives somewhere as an aphorism: "Whoever is not a misanthrope at forty has never loved mankind."

Shelley did not live to be forty and can therefore be excused from the requirement of misanthropy. Certain it is that he loved mankind, knew it well, and labored for its present and future welfare. Mr. Grabo in his "Magic Plant" is as impatient for the recognition of these facts as Shelley was for the recognition of his reforming ideas, and it can be added that whereas Shelley failed, through no fault of his own, Mr. Grabo fully succeeds, through merits very much his own. His scholarship is ripe, conceals itself, and produces a narrative both intricate and clear, rich in topical allusions and historically sound. One by one the legends of Shelley's folly, of his unrealistic visions, muddled thinking, and personal irresponsibility are shattered by the evidence. Unlike Swift's, Shelley's subject matter and preoccupations are very near ours. If we once give up the anthology habit and read the poet entire, we shall be forced to admit that he was sensible and could think. Shaw had already found this out for himself, but few heeded him. It required special studies in Shelley's poetry and prose, of which Mr. Grabo is now giving us the fourth and all-inclusive one. Shelley, the specialist in west winds and glass domes, has definitely given place to the realist who could write the sonnet "England in 1819," and that substitution of biographical images is an important part of the general rehabilitation of romanticism visible in the rediscovery of Büchner and Beddoes and Pushkin.

JACQUES BARZUN

Shorter Notices

EDNA ST. VINCENT MILLAY AND HER TIMES. By Elizabeth Atkins. University of Chicago Press. $3.

It is Miss Atkins's purpose to blaze footpaths through the works and days of Edna St. Vincent Millay—the "unrivaled embodiment of sex appeal, the It-girl of the hour, the Miss America of 1920"—even though they open on blind alleys and bins of old lumber. The plan of her volume is accordingly a simple one: she has compiled a list of all the Elizabethans (it would appear) from Peele to Fletcher and appropriated for Miss Millay the pattern of their sundry virtues—a useful prerequisite, certainly, for one who wrote only one "bad line of blank verse in her life." As it happens, Shakespeare is the name most frequently coupled with that of the poet's, but it cannot be said that Miss Atkins has stinted with his contemporaries. Millay's alliteration, for example, is like Shakespeare's and Greene's; Sonnet VI of "Fatal Interview" is "like something out of Webster or Shakespeare"; Sonnet XXXIX suggests the "fresh homeliness of Peele"; and so on. It being also true that Miss Millay is "Elizabethan, Chaucerian, Anglo-Saxon, Vergilian, and Sapphic without being eclectic," the author pauses to apprehend, "like horns out of fairyland" or the "Cambridge History of English Literature," the voices of no less than twenty-six poets in concert, from Aeschylus to Rimbaud, palpitating between the pentameters of "Fatal Interview." Elsewhere we are invited to note the likeness of certain lyrics to "the line of a Beardsley drawing," the colors of Gauguin and Matisse, the sonatas of Beethoven, and the pantry of the housewife stocked with "halibut, herrings, mutton, oaten bread, cheese, baked oysters even." When it seems there has been no hyperbolical stone left unturned to intimate the author's good opinion of her heroine we are asked to deplore with her the fact that "Millay's poetry really needs a whole new system of prosody." Our regrets, however, are better bestowed elsewhere.

BEN BELITT

CANDLE INDOORS. By Helen Hull. Coward-McCann. $2.50

In this her tenth novel Miss Hull tells of the domestic tribulations of a successful and charming manufacturer of automobile accessories who does not begin to realize the responsibilities of parenthood until his wife is in her grave and his relatives and in-laws are pestering him about the rearing of his three children. As his youngsters develop from early adolescence to maturity, Arnold Carlton supposedly matures with them and changes from a what-they-don't-know-won't-hurt-them kind of good fellow into a father who is positively maternal in his selfless concern for his children's welfare. It is a good idea and would have made a good novel except for one

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

important factor: although Miss Hull tells us a great deal about Arnold Carlton, she does not seem to know the kind of man she means him to be intimately enough to make him humanly convincing. His unreality is all the more striking because the lesser characters—the children, the professorial brother-in-law, the medical sister-in-law, the poetic son-in-law—are recognizable and real. If its main character were omitted, "Candle Indoors" would be another competent novel of middle-class family life. With him left in so prominently, however, its main effect is to emphasize once more how extremely difficult it is for even the most talented of women novelists to portray sympathetically any men except those who are so highly intellectual that, psychologically and essentially, they are no longer masculine.

GRACE ADAMS

DRAMA

Plays, Pleasant and Unpleasant

LILLIAN HELLMAN, who wrote that powerful and disturbing play "The Children's Hour," has written another almost as powerful and almost as disturbing called "Days to Come" (Vanderbilt Theater). So far as their themes are concerned the plays have little in common, for the first was a study of a purely individual problem in abnormal psychology while the second centers around an industrial conflict and seems to point a definite Marxian moral—namely, that men are sundered from one another by a difference in class interests between which no personal good-will can adjudicate. But the interesting fact is that two plays, superficially so different, should be so obviously the product of the same temperament and the same talent. In each the mood, the atmosphere, the peculiar nature of the tension produced, all the intangibles in fact, are almost identical. There are the same unresolved discords, the same sultry hates, the same murderous impulses below the surface of decorous lives, the same hopeless struggle against an evil that no one dares name, the same quiet but burning intensity of utterance. And it is among such things as these that the common denominator of the two plays is to be sought. Miss Hellman is not a specialist in abnormal psychology and not a specialist in the Marxian interpretation of society. She is a specialist in hate and frustration, a student of helpless rage, an articulator of inarticulate loathings. Ibsen and also Chekhov have been mentioned in connection with her plays. Strindberg would be nearer, though perhaps still far enough from the mark.

"The Children's Hour" was successful and popular despite the almost universal agreement that it so nearly deserted its own subject in the last act as to leave one emotionally suspended and dubious. Curiously enough, the most serious defect of the present play is similar—one is not sure just where its center lies. Of the several stories the one which has the clearest outline is that of the weak but well-meaning owner of an unprofitable factory who allows himself to be persuaded into importing a group of strike-breakers—in actuality professional thugs—determined to settle his labor difficulties by methods he would never have dreamed of employing. Nor is there, in this particular story, anything obscure in regard either to what happens or to the "side" which Miss Hellman takes. The most doctrinaire exponent of the class conflict could hardly object to her picture of events or to the inter-

THEATRES

THE THEATRE GUILD presents
The Pulitzer Prize Play
IDIOT'S DELIGHT
by Robert E. Sherwood
with ALFRED LUNT
and LYNN FONTANNE
SHUBERT THEA., 44 St. W. of B'way, 300 seats $1.10
Mats.: Thurs. and Sat. 2:45. Eves. 8:45
Seats Now for New Year's Eve

PRELUDE TO EXILE
by William McNally with
WILFRID LAWSON · EVA LE GALLIENNE · LUCILE WATSON
GUILD THEA., 52nd St., W. of Broadway. Eves., 8:40
Matinees THURSDAY and SATURDAY, 2:40
Seats Now for New Year's Eve

"Original and deeply moving."—Atkinson, *Times*
"JOHNNY JOHNSON"
"One of the most original and also one of the most entertaining of recent American plays. The music is superb."—*JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH, Nation.*
44th ST. Theatre, W. of Bway. Eves.: 8.40; 55c to $2.75
Mats. Christmas Day & Sat., 2.40; 55c to $2.20
Seats now for Special New Year's Eve Performance

FOUR HOLIDAY PERFORMANCES
Two Sunday Eves.—Dec. 27th and Jan. 3rd, at 8:45
Two Matinees—Tues., Dec. 29th, & Wed., Dec. 30th, at 2:45
RUTH DRAPER
In Her Character Sketches
GUILD THEATRE, W. 52nd St. For Reservations Phone COl. 5-8829

FROLIC

★★★★ NEW THEATRE'S New Year's Eve FROLIC
"SWINGTIME IN SAMOA"
Stars of Stage, Screen and Radio!
CLUB VALHALLA SWING BAND
PALM GARDENS—52nd St. W. of 8th Ave.
Admission $1.25 in advance; $1.50 at door
Seats now, New Theatre, 156 W. 44th St.
New Theatre League, 117 W. 46th St., and Workers Book Shops

SCHOOL

WORKERS SCHOOL
Winter Term Registration
COURSES IN:
Science and Dialectics
Economics
Historical Materialism
Marxism-Leninism
Literature
American History
Labor History
Current Events
Research Methods
Psychology
Labor Journalism
Russian
And many other courses
For Descriptive Catalogue D write to the School Office, 35 E. 12th St., N. Y. C.

LECTURE

Spain Speaks!

HON. DR.
FERNANDO DE LOS RIOS
Spanish Ambassador to the U. S.
MADISON SQUARE GARDEN
Monday Evening, Jan. 4th, at 8:30
Prof. JOHN DEWEY, Chairman
ADMISSION: 25c, 55c, $1.10, $1.65, $2.20. On Sale at Columbia Univ. Bookstore. Call Bookstore, Workers' Bookshops, Rand Bookstore, N. Y. U. Bookstore.
Auspices: United Spanish Societies to Aid Spain. GR. 7-4138

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pretation which she puts upon them. But there are several other stories concerned with the neurotic complications within the family of the factory owner, and one is never sure what the connection between the two is or where the emphasis is to be placed.

Faced with a somewhat similar problem in "Paradise Lost" Mr. Odets solved it formally if absurdly by assuming that the two things were directly related—that in a world economically disordered men naturally suffered from sexual impotence and women naturally got queer ideas. I do not think, however, that Miss Hellman is intending to expound quite so simple a doctrine, and if she is, then she certainly does not make the fact very clear. But I do not, on the other hand, know exactly what relation the two themes bear to each other, or exactly what are their relative positions in the play. Is it about a labor situation which developed under conditions one of the accidentals of which was the neurotic character of the capitalist family? Or is it, as seems to me almost equally probable, about a group of neurotic people who became involved in labor difficulties just as they became involved in various others? Nor is the question merely academic, for the result of our inability to feel an answer is that we are always more or less lost in the midst of the events that are being so powerfully presented. The two themes are given emphasis so nearly equal that we are never entirely clear which the play is really about. And I am not sure but that this is because Miss Hellman herself has not yet made clear contact with the sources of her own power. She is fascinated by her own hatred of something. The passion of that hatred gets itself partially expressed when she chooses a fiendish child as object or when she chooses a strike-breaking thug. But I am not sure that she yet knows what the motive power behind her creative ability really is. These are occasions for her rage. Are they really causes? I think that when I first reviewed "The Children's Hour" I made it clear that I had great respect for the play though I did not exactly enjoy it. Some such reservation I shall have to make again in connection with "Days to Come," despite the fact that it is very skilfully directed by Mr. Shumlin and very well acted indeed. Like the earlier play it produces and sustains an agonizing tension. It also leaves the nerves sore.

"You Can't Take It with You" (Booth Theater), by George Kaufman and Moss Hart, belongs as indisputably in the category of pleasant plays as Miss Hellman's does in the antithetical one. The idea is to exhibit the engaging follies of a family each member of which is wholly given over to his own hobbies but each of whom gets along in joyous confusion with the others because each is instinctively loyal to live-and-let-live principles. It is too bad that despite all the freshness of the details Mr. Kaufman and his collaborator should again be content with a plot outline as stale as one about two lovers who are almost separated because the conventional parents of the one cannot stomach the unconventional parents of the other (Mr. Kaufman ought not to be content to rewrite "Moon Over Mulberry Street," to go no farther back); but the farcical extravagances are so merry that one can and will forgive all that. Even more important perhaps is the fact that the whole thing is pervaded by a humanity, an amiability, and a gaiety wholly delightful. It will have a run and will, I hope, lead a lot of people to yield to their suppressed desire to keep snakes on the mantlepiece, play the xylophone, manufacture fireworks in the cellar, or do any of the other multifarious things the members of this happy family do with such whole-hearted enthusiasm.

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

RECORDS

THE wax that Columbia puts into the grooves of its records, and that has to be removed by the needle before the records can begin to sound properly, is intended to produce a quieter surface, which eventually it does. But I must question whether record buyers will consider the slight difference—for Victor surfaces are not exactly noisy—worth what it costs in spoiled reproduction during the first playings (and I have heard records betray the presence of the wax even after repeated playings). A person who buys the ordinary four- or five-record set must spend a few hours merely in getting it to the point where it begins to sound as it should. Is Columbia justified in asking this; is it wise? Is it willing that people get the idea of the quality of its recording that I know some to have got who did not spend the few hours, who, for instance, tried the records in a store? I ask these questions about the ordinary four- or five-record set; what shall I say about a set like that of Verdi's "Falstaff," with its fourteen records? And what shall I say as a reviewer who has the responsibility of reporting on the quality of the set, and has the wax to worry about on top of all the other things there are to worry about?

For there are other things. One hears a metallic edge in the violin tone in the Columbia recording of Haydn's Symphony No. 99 by the London Philharmonic under Beecham; and one has to play other records of violin tone to establish the fact that the distortion is in the recording, not in the reproduction; after which one adds that the symphony is one of Haydn's finest, the performance excellent, and the set indispensable in spite of its fault (three records, $5). Or one has to play other recent Columbia records by the Roth String Quartet in order to be sure that this set of Schubert's "Death and the Maiden" Quartet is actually as inferior as it sounds (five records, $7). And one has to determine that the marked inferiority of certain sides is not due to variation in the needles, but to variation either in recording conditions or in the pressing.

To return now to "Falstaff" (fourteen records, $21), I have got enough of the wax out to be able to say that certain sides of my set give results that are flawed, but that on the whole the recording is very good, enabling one to hear clearly the subtlety, the delicious wit, the sheer loveliness of this miraculous score—for surely it is miraculous that the refinement of the art that produced "Rigoletto" and "Traviata" should have produced the Mozartian tracery of what is in fact the greatest operatic comedy after Mozart's "Figaro" and "Don Giovanni." The cast and performance are such—in their excellences and imperfections—as one hears in an opera house; which is not good enough for records.

If you insist on believing that Kreisler deserves his reputation, do not make the mistake of comparing his new Victor recording of the Beethoven Concerto (six records, $11) with Szigeti's on Columbia, as I did record for record, for you may have to admit that it is reduced to insignificance. The vitality that Kreisler lacks you will find in Wanda Landowska's superb performances of Bach's Chromatic Fantasy and Fugue, Partita in B flat, and six inconsequential little Preludes (four records, $8). Two other important Victor releases—the complete "Marriage of Figaro" and the album of Debussy's songs—I must postpone.

B. H. HAGGIN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters to the Editors

The Spanish Anarchists

Dear Sirs: In the first paragraph of his personal impressions, Under Fire in Madrid, in *The Nation* of December 12 Louis Fischer found it necessary to report that "on November 16 the Anarchist column fled in front of a small Moorish force and allowed the rebels to enter the university suburb." The implication is obvious: the fleeing Anarchists were responsible for the first great success of the rebels during the siege of Madrid.

It is of course possible that Mr. Fischer saw a small detachment of Anarchist militiamen retreating before a surprise attack coming from the opposing side. But it is just as possible that he took his information from the editor of the *Mundo Obrero*, official Communist organ, who on August 4 wrote that "the Spanish people were fighting under the direction of the government in defense of their republic and of democracy against *counter-revolutionary anarchism* and fascism." (Quoted from the pamphlet "Spain Defends Democracy," page 18, issued officially by the Communist Party of the United States.)

The facts about the Spanish Anarchists are as follows:

1. For the last sixty years the Spanish Anarchists have been the romantic daredevils of their country's labor movement. Whatever unorthodox thinking they may have been guilty of, the accusation of cowardice has never been brought against them.

2. The "Anarchist column" referred to by Mr. Fischer was the pick of the Barcelona Anarchists, who first fought for months on the Saragossa and Huesca fronts against the well-nigh impregnably intrenched insurgent army and then came to the rescue of Madrid. The leader of that column, Buenaventura Durruti, most famous of all contemporary Spanish Anarchists, was killed at the Madrid front in the university suburb two or three days after the "event" reported by Mr. Fischer. He is the same Durruti whom the *New Masses* of June 9 accused of working with the fascists.

3. Your correspondent's implication is contradicted in the same issue of *The Nation* by Louis F. Gittler (Barcelona: An Anarchist State), who reports that the young Anarchists of the F. A. I. (Iberian Anarchist Federation) "unarmed, crashed through the cannon at strategic points."

We protest against Mr. Fischer's biased reporting as harmful to the workers' unity in this crucial moment for the freedom of Spain and the world.

MAX NOMAD, STEPHEN NAFT,
CARLO TRESCA, ANITA BRENNER,
J. M. ESCUDER

New York, December 18

The Church and Murder

Dear Sirs: May the privilege be mine of submitting an open letter to Lawrence A. Fernsworth in response to his letter to me, published in your issue of November 28:

My dear Fernsworth: By an amicable agreement your letter addressed to the Editor of *America* was published by *The Nation*. During the past few years, in several articles, you interpreted for us the complexities of the progress of the Republican government in Spain. This summer I was most eager to get in communication with you, and to request contributions on the current Spanish situation. I received your two letters, and was prepared to publish that on Sotelo, for it touched on a most important fact. Your second letter was three times too long for our use, and was, I felt, the sort of statement that you might later regret. It was that consideration which held back publication: the fact that you had just returned from witnessing harrowing, nauseating scenes, and that you were aroused by certain statements contained in some articles contributed to *America* by Jaime Castiello and John P. Delaney.

Have no further doubts about my attitude, or about the attitude of your church and mine, on murder. There is no double standard; murder, executions, atrocities committed by Franco's men and by Franco himself are to be condemned, utterly and absolutely. They are to be condemned the more, as you will agree, because Franco and his men, having greater knowledge and stricter professions in such matters, have therefore greater guilt. Our sole difference is on the facts: you grant only probability to the reported atrocities committed by the Loyalists; I have certainty that the Loyalists have been guilty of atrocities. While I grant only probability to the wholesale cruelties attributed to the insurgents, you assert with certainty that the insurgents have killed their "thousands upon thousands in cold blood." You have facts, I presume, to prove your charges; on that basis, I would cry out, and our church would cry out, in condemnation of murders and other crimes perpetrated by the insurgents. No, Mr. Fernsworth, we do not excuse nor do we condone the insurgent acts; neither do we excuse nor do we condone the acts of the Loyalists. There is only one standard: murder is murder no matter who commits it.

FRANCIS TALBOT, S.J.,
Editor of *America*

New York, December 15

Misused Used Cars

Dear Sirs: My attention has been called to the recent article in your publication called The Misused Car Market [sic] in which you cast serious reflections on a very large and growing industry.

Not only this, but you make statements which are not in accordance with facts. When you state that the weld will eventually reopen and that the metal will not take a second weld, you indicate that you are not acquainted with engineering practice.

As a representative of one of the largest manufacturers of arc welding equipment in the world we resent such misstatements of facts and ask that you make a retraction and correction in your next issue.

A. F. DAVIS, Vice-President,
The Lincoln Electric Company

New York, December 14

[An article entitled The Used-Car Racket, by Elliott Arnold, appeared in *The Nation* for September 19.]

Dear Sirs: I have no doubt that given enough time and cash the master minds of the welding industry can perform all sorts of miracles. Almost anything can be done with time and money. But the only point of my whole piece—which the complainant seems to have chosen deliberately to ignore—was that the racketeering dealers of whom I wrote were racketeers solely because they failed to have automobiles properly repaired.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If used-car dealers invested enough time and money to set up cars properly, there wouldn't have been any need for my article. It was written to throw some light on a dishonest and unchecked practice. Crooked used-car dealers have one thought in mind: to get their mechanical wrecks to run in the cheapest way and the shortest time, with no regard for what happens afterward. Mr. Davis's plaint doesn't alter that thesis one bit.

ELLIOTT ARNOLD

New York, December 16

"The Stones Awake"—Last Round

Dear Sirs: I think that Carleton Beals's twelve-point indictment of my accuracy as a book reviewer, in *The Nation* for December 5, would have been more effective had Mr. Beals been accurate himself. To say, for example, that "Mexico had no presidents named 'Gil' or 'Rubio,'" gives an unfortunate impression of pettifoggery. The presidents referred to were Emilio Portes Gil and Pascual Ortiz Rubio; and though in Spanish they are properly indexed by their double last names as "Portes Gil" and "Ortiz Rubio," in the New York *Times* and other American papers they are indexed merely as "Gil" and "Rubio."

The other alleged mistakes are too trivial to warrant my answering in detail here. I plead unqualifiedly guilty only to one: calling "Black River" his first instead of his second novel. As for the rest, their nature would seem to justify my praise of Mr. Beals's journalistic abilities while minimizing his talents as a novelist. He seems to forget that I was reviewing "The Stones Awake," which is a novel, and not attacking his political interpretation of Mexican history.

LEIGH WHITE

New York, December 7

The British Genius

Dear Sirs: In a letter to his sister, written in 1887, William James referred to a jubilee for Queen Victoria, and then commented as follows: ". . . the density of British unintellectuality is a spectacle for gods. One can't imagine it or describe it. One can only *see* it. . . ." (Italics those of James.) In the light of recent events in England, these words may interest readers of *The Nation.*

JAMES T. FARRELL

Washington, D. C., December 14

CONTRIBUTORS

LOUIS ADAMIC recently contributed to *The Nation* two articles on the technique of the sitdown strike. Last spring when a Pacific Coast maritime strike was threatened, he interviewed Bridges in San Francisco for *The Nation.*

MAXWELL S. STEWART during a six years' residence in China taught at Yenching University and for a brief period acted as manager of the Nationalist (Chinese-American) News Agency.

ALBERT VITON is the pseudonym of an American journalist who has been in Palestine since the beginning of the Arab disturbances last year. Articles by him reporting the fighting between the Arabs and Jews and analyzing the forces behind the struggle have appeared in *The Nation* from time to time and have excited wide comment.

WILLIAM PATTERSON is a reporter on the New York *American* who has specialized in municipal government and state and city politics.

L. O. PRENDERGAST, a journalist now living in Mexico City, has on various occasions in the past interpreted Mexican events for readers of *The Nation.*

KLAUS MANN, formerly editor of the literary journal, *Die Sammlung,* published in Amsterdam, is now living in this country and working on a novel based on the life of Tchaikovsky.

DELFINO CINELLI, an Italian novelist, was formerly literary editor of the *Corriere Della Sera* of Milan.

WILLIAM TROY is a member of the English Department of Bennington College.

JACQUES BARZUN, author of "The French Race; A Study in Social and Cultural Ideology," is a member of the History Department of Columbia University.

B. H. HAGGIN, *The Nation's* music critic, has just finished "A Book of the Symphony," which he describes as "a work of popularization in which I use a technique of my own to present to the layman the form of the symphony." It will shortly be issued by the Oxford University Press.

INFORMATION FOR SUBSCRIBERS

THE NATION Price, 15 cents a copy. By subscription—Domestic: One year $5; Two years $8; Three years $11. Canaian: 50 cents a year additional. The Nation is indexed in Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature. Book Review Digest, Dramatic Index, Index to Labor Periodicals, Public Affairs Information Service. Three weeks' notice and the old address as well as the new are required for subscriber's change of address.

MAGAZINE

WRITERS

GET THIS HELPFUL MAGAZINE!

This great 68-page magazine of the writing profession is welcomed by writers everywhere. The editors of *Redbook, Liberty, Cosmopolitan, Collier's* and 2,500 other magazines use WRITER'S DIGEST to tell our readers what they buy and how much they pay authors. Sound advice from leading editors in every issue. Also official accurate market tips in every issue covering a vast number of different markets.

WRITER'S DIGEST is endorsed by writers and editors because it offers practical, helpful advice to authors.

Boon to Writers. Endorsed by Editors.

Subscribers have earned over $1,000,000 selling their literary work. Beginning and professional writers regularly read and study this helpful magazine. *The use of* WRITER'S DIGEST *can make money for you as it has for thousands of others.*

SPECIAL INTRODUCTORY OFFER

For new subscribers ONLY—we will enter a *three* month's special trial subscription for 25c. (The newsstand price is 25c a copy.) *Take advantage of this bargain.* Send 25c in cash or stamps today.

25¢ 3 Months Trial Offer

WRITER'S DIGEST

22-A East 12th Street Cincinnati, Ohio

ADDITIONAL RESORT ADVERTISING ON OPPOSITE PAGE

RESORT

The Vendome "Your Winter Home"

MADISON AVE. AT THIRD ST. LAKEWOOD, N.J.

Private Baths—Private Sun Porches—Southern Exposure. All sport facilities. Intelligent supervision of diets. Moderate rates.

M. SCHWARTZ, R.N. Phone Lakewood 555.

You can, too,—sell your property!

One advertiser writes: "We ran this ad in *The Nation* once. As a result I sold our house on the terms described. In response to my ad, I got about seven other replies, one or two of which I could have probably sold the house to if the present buyers hadn't bought it."

Rates: Minimum ½ in. (30 words), $3.08; each additional 6 words, 62c.

THE NATION

20 Vesey Street New York City

When writing to advertisers please mention The Nation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED